




11/10 1/14

(245)



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE
TO MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY

The Intelligent Man's Guide to MARRIAGE *and* CELIBACY

By

JUANITA TANNER

¶

page 204
(An argument against the importance
of the physical in marriage; pages
177 & 180. and marriage in

the past, tho. we argue ourselves
block in the face, has been with
normal people based practically
on physical attraction. men don't
marry women with faces, which as
"they say" "Would slip a cluck, and
never will."

THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY
PUBLISHERS INDIANAPOLIS

They like want intelligence
but they don't want to sleep
with it, only, nor eat breakfast
with it, endlessly.

Marriage is an emotional affair,
any man who looks at it.

COPYRIGHT, 1929, BY JUANITA TANNER

FIRST EDITION

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRESS OF
BRAUNWORTH & CO., INC.,
BOOK MANUFACTURERS
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

PREFACE

I have been thinking about writing this book for several years. A year ago my natural laziness received a deserved rebuke in the appearance of a volume with a similar title which undertook to guide women through the difficulties of economics, and I feel that the time has come to give to mankind my own conclusions on a subject of no less importance.

If I believed in heredity (which I do not) I might say that I was destined from the beginning for this undertaking.

My father was a reformer of society, my mother a very clever woman, and they married each other with the object of, so to speak, bettering themselves. As a result I may be said to combine the realization of need for change with feminine practicality about the kind of change to make.

You have no doubt become familiar with a section of my parents' history through a play called *Man and Superman*. In it you remember that my father, John Tanner, was shown to be a person of noble intentions which sometimes failed to see him through a difficult situation. You will not be surprised to hear that his further history included loss of his money through one of the philanthropic schemes which blossomed prematurely early in this century, so that it was necessary for the family to move to this country when I was quite small.

On the whole I have never regretted growing up an American, though it has deprived me of the pleasure of knowing my grandfather except through his writings. Mother, who is without reverence for any one, calls him Bernard or even, when she is angry, George, but I can never think of him except as Mr. Shaw.

From his latest book I judge that, like my father, he believes that when we have equality of income a lot of our difficulties will be settled. And I'm sure that equality of income will be very

nice, if there really is plenty to go around. But I don't think it will make us as happy as some other reforms might, because income is only part of the problem after all. There's not much fun in having money if you have to spend it alone or with the wrong people. Handy as an economic millennium would be for most of us, some might prefer a satisfactory reckoning in their personal relationships.

My grandfather himself has pointed out that as a man's business is to get means to live like a gentleman, a woman's business is to get married. Of course things have changed since he wrote that, and as an American girl without a family fortune I've found that getting means is quite as much my business as my brother's. Still it's true that our spheres of action have so long been divided by this tradition that we haven't yet got over the effects of the division.

You, for example, like many intelligent men, may feel no great interest in the subject of this book. You will, unless you have definitely broken with tradition, find yourself very busy with other matters. You may speculate about the question in odd moments; you may marry and wish you hadn't, or not marry and wish you had; you may be made happy or miserable all your life by it, but still you leave it to women as they have left the matter of earning a living to you.

This seems to me very unfortunate. I can see no real reason why a man should be appointed administrator of the eighth commandment while a woman is given charge of the seventh; no reason why masculine minds should be turned aside to corn laws when they feel that interest in the welfare of humanity which the Victorians called the reform spirit and which is now referred to as the Messiah complex. Even if we throw out all talk of altruistic reform and say simply that we want to manage our own affairs sensibly and make the world a better place to live in for our own selfish sakes, then common sense says that as it takes two to make a marriage there's a better chance of success if we both think a little about it.

PREFACE

Grandfather, in fact, pointed out before I was born the disadvantages of a society in which the serious business of sex was left by men to women, and the serious business of nutrition left by women to men. I'm not one of those smart young things who claims discovery of something her grandfather knew. But the point is that when grandfather made his will he considered, as the British do, only the male heirs, and he devoted all his resources to improving their economic situation.

To be sure he addressed himself to women because, as the trouble with the business of nutrition was leaving it to men, feminine action seemed to offer the best hope for improvement. Similarly I, with proposals to improve the sex business, must address myself to you.

Of course, when I say that men have not as a rule taken the subject very seriously I must except the professional commentators—bishops, rabbis and cardinals, literary doctors and humanistic professors and German lecturers and Denver judges. Good men, learned men, but professional men and so devoting thought to the otherwise feminine problem merely as a part of their business. This separates them from the lay majority so effectively that many of them, no doubt unconscious of the discrepancy, practise as individuals measures quite different from those they publicly recommend.

The fact is that while intelligent laymen like yourself have left the subject to women these men have usually tried to settle it, by law or ecclesiastical edict, entirely without reference to the feminine half of the population. You may put the whole thing in feminine hands and go peaceably about your business, but the legal and churchly assumption for ages has been that women were not qualified to decide anything even for themselves.

Thus we have had the curious contradiction of all moral pressure originating within church and state applied by men, and all moral pressure outside these institutions—that is the much more powerful pressure of society and the family—supplied by women. It seems fairly obvious that the failure of church and

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

civil authorities to deal adequately with the problem is due to the fact that their versions of marriage have been conceived, developed and fostered by only one-half the race, and that the half not generally interested in its success.

One remedy is of course to admit women to positions of authority in church and state. Then we should abolish the conflict between them and the world at large—that is, the world of women interested in marriage. But I advise you to consider all the implications of this solution before you adopt it. At present things are in rather a mess because while women manage the game the rules were made by men. If women make the rules no doubt things will go more smoothly. However, you will still be expected to play even if you don't give your mind to it. And when you begin to take a hand under the new rules it's just possible that you will think you might have made better ones.

At least, in spite of general masculine disinterest, I am cheered by the belief that as women are taking a hand in your business of earning a living, increasing numbers of men are taking some notice of what has been women's province. This may only be due to a newly perceived connection between the two. At any rate a famous journalistic adviser on marriage problems announced not long ago that "Before the war seventy-five per cent. of my letters came from women. To-day forty-five per cent. of my correspondents are men."

I do not of course advise you to seek this particular oracle as a source of wisdom; on the contrary, the most valuable discussion of the question for some time has been in the far from oracular works of Anita Loos. Their wide sale should do much to tear down moss-grown superstitions about the feminine mind, and you may if you like regard this volume as a serious effort to build on the site cleared by Miss Loos's exertions. I feel that I owe almost as much to her as to my grandfather.

This reminds me of another point. The American preface to *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* was very flattering to American women. I have no intention of going in for national differences

iv

PREFACE

but I shall, if you don't mind, make a distinction of age. I am going to assume for the purpose of this book that you are not only an intelligent man but an intelligent man of this decade. As you have no doubt noticed, there are still going about among us many intelligent men and women of the year 1880, perhaps now and then an intelligent man or woman of the year of our Lord 1500, or of 400 B.C. Earlier models have not disappeared with the appearance of new types.

For the sake of brevity then, I shall call you an intelligent young man, though you know of course that youth is a matter of view-point not of years, and my father and my grandfather are actually much younger than some men still in their twenties.

I may assume also, I think, that as you are intelligent and young you are just a bit bored with your own traditional duty and therefore in some small degree curious about mine, or you wouldn't have picked up this book at all. But I shall have to talk a little about your business of money just as in his guide-book my grandfather talked about my business of marriage. It is impossible to say all there is to say about anything without saying a little about everything.

Perhaps—who knows?—if you should be really interested we can put our heads together and do something about both Adam's and Eve's curse in this topsyturvy day when the prevailing expression for sex appeal is the neuter pronoun.

At any rate you may find support for your interest in a good source. Should any less intelligent young man suggest that it's beneath your dignity to give to marriage a little of the sober thought you'd give to your future economic status please remind him that the Most Intelligent Man—who was likewise widely experienced in matrimony—said, "It is better to dwell in a corner of the housetop than with a brawling woman in a wide house."

JUANITA WHITEFIELD TANNER

NEW YORK CITY
December, 1928

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is due the following publishers for their courteous permission to use copyrighted material: to D. Appleton & Company for lines from Don Marquis' *Noah an' Jonah an' Cap'n John Smith*; to Columbia University Press for the quotation from *The Economic Principles of Confucius and His School*, by Dr. Chen Huan-Chang, in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law; to Doubleday, Doran and Company, publishers of *The Doctor Looks at Love and Life*, by Joseph Collins, M. D., and *The Woman a Man Marries*, by Victor Pedersen, M. D.; to E. P. Dutton & Co. who publish *Sex and Civilization*, by Paul Bousfield, *Daedalus, or The Future of Science*, by J. B. S. Haldane, and *Women and Leisure*, by Lorine Pruette; to Ginn and Company for the quotation from Sumner's *Folkways*; to Harcourt, Brace and Company as publishers of Margaret Widdemer's *Collected Poems*, Count Keyserling's *The Book of Marriage* and W. B. Seabrook's *The Magic Island*; to the Houghton Mifflin Company who publish Havelock Ellis' *Essays in Wartime*; to Harper & Brothers, publishers of *Ways of Behaviorism*, by John B. Watson; and to G. P. Putnam's Sons, publishers of *Sex and Character*, by Otto Weininger. Quotations from *Grenstone Poems*, by Wytter Bynner, *Woman, A Vindication*, by Anthony Ludovici, and *The Human Body*, by Logan Clendening, M. D., are made by permission of and special arrangement with Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., authorized publishers. Horace Liveright, Inc., kindly granted permission to quote from *The Revolt of Modern Youth*; Longmans, Green & Co. from Andrew Lang's *Ballades in Blue China*; the Macmillan Company from Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, from *Man and Woman*, by Havelock Ellis, and from *Lady Baltimore*, by Owen Wister. W. W. Norton & Company, publishers of *About Ourselves*, by

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

H. A. Overstreet; the J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Company, publishers of Tolstoi's *The Kreutzer Sonata*; Journal of Nervous & Mental Diseases Publishing Company, publishers of C. G. Jung's *Theory of Psychoanalysis*; Reilly & Lee Co., publishers of Edgar Guest's *Famous Women of the Future*, and Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers of Stevenson's *Virginibus Puerisque* gave further permissions. The quotation from *Science and Personality*, by William Brown, is by courtesy of Yale University Press; and that from *Possible Worlds*, by courtesy of the author, J. B. S. Haldane.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

"WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?"

An upheaval which makes repose impossible. Nourishment and children as the two major concerns of mankind. Is the best solution for the individual the best for society? PAGE 19

2

TRIAL AND ERROR

Experimental marriage an old story. Nature's careless methods impractical for the individual. Your experiment: its conditions; available data; methods of procedure; results. 24

3

CHARTING THE CHANGES

Women in your path. The new necessity of sharing. The revolution that mother made. 27

4

WHAT HAPPENED TO BUSINESS

Immigrants in industry. Competitive workers and dependent wives. Work as a nuisance. The burden of responsibility for others *vs.* individual obligation to self-support. 29

5

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE HOME

The shrinkage in families and in households. Bachelor comfort. Your chance to escape the grindstone. 33

6

THE STATUE GOES ON A BUST

The change in manners. Social equality and reconstruction. The scarcity of angels. 36

7

HONI SOIT . . .

The change in manners. Fewer clothes but what of it? Denatured cosmetics. 40

8

SURVEYING THE AMAZON

Even physical changes. Taller and fleetier ladies expand their chests. The progress from wish to reality. 43

9

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

Women's habit of striving to please gives you an advantage. The force of example. 44

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

10

FALLING IN LOVE AND FALLING OUT

The problem of acquiring a reasonable competency in love. A lifetime annuity or a quick turnover? PAGE 46

11

LOVE: FIRST QUALITY

Love as food and clothing. Youth finds family approval inadequate. Self-improvement as a bid for admiration. 47

12

LOVE: SECOND RATE

Tabloid impressions. Time and space limitations. The selfish variety of love connected with sex. 50

13

SEX DIFFERENCES AND THEIR CAUSES

The power of advertising lends importance to that which is essentially unimportant. 55

14

MENS SANA

Irrelevance of sex in mind. The effect of training on the mind. The democratic theory that change is possible. 58

15

BALANCE

Completeness through symmetrical development of the individual or by the theory of complements. Complements must be equal and similar. Sex differences a deterrent to correspondence. 62

16

COOPERATION

Summarizing the conditions of your experiment. The case against sex. . . 68

17

THE CONSOLATIONS OF RELIGION

God made in man's image subject to sex difference. Jehovah the father and Mary the mother. 70

18

AS GOD OR AS GODS

Jehovistic pessimism supplies a second account of creation. The Snake's invitation. Jehovah's responsibility. Curses laid on Adam and Eve not commands but consequences. 71

19

WATER INTO WINE

Christian optimism and its teachings of liberty, equality and fraternity. Revolutionary conclusions as to the unimportance of sex, the mental nature of sin, obligations to children. 76

CONTENTS

20

BENEFIT OF CLERGY

Ecclesiastical conservatism and how it grew by robbing Paul to pay Peter. Is revolt from orthodoxy a return to Christianity? PAGE 83

21

THE DOGMAS OF SCIENCE

Science holds the place of medieval religion, but not without schisms within the fold and heretics outside. 89

22

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION

Constitutional rebellion against the tyranny of nature. Failure of theology to rise to the occasion. 89

23

FREUDIAN LIMITATIONS

Original Sin newly disguised as heredity. Restrictions of the sexual school of psychology. 92

24

AND A LITTLE CHILD SHALL LEAD THEM

"I was free born," says Doctor Watson with Saint Paul. The Christian assumptions of Behaviorism. 95

25

THE EGO HAS ITS SAY

Your mind escapes the psychologists. Their value in outlining instincts and habits. Possibility of overcoming both. 96

26

EPPUR SI MUOVE

The instinct for progress. Conscious evolution and the doctrine of mental stimuli. Scientific dissolution of solid material arguments. 100

27

TOWARD ETHICS?

Conditions of the scientific millennium. Miracles of mechanical multiplication imply self-control, personal and creative modesty. Approach to the religious code. 105

28

THE PROMISES OF ROMANCE

That which is new, strange, marvelous. Literature as the world's wish. Connection between popular reading and popular life. 108

29

JUST A SWEET OLD-FASHIONED LOVE STORY

Past tendencies to sugar-coat and emphasize sex. The clinging heroine and her hero living happily by the double standard. 111

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

30

THE DAME SCHOOL OF EXPERIENCE

Otherwise known as the Emetic School, or the new school of social research. Realism plagiarizes from the psychoanalysts. . . . PAGE 113

31

THE HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

Reformers who break up the furniture. Modern morality plays teach an obvious but perhaps necessary lesson. . . . 117

32

COMIC RELIEF

Hail to the Comic Spirit and a sense of proportion. How humor earns its happy ending. . . . 121

33

"THY FACE IS FAR . . ."

True romance still ahead. Sex no longer new, strange or marvelous. Possibilities in mental exploration. Stern requirements of the romantic ideal. . . . 124

34

DROPPING THE PILOTS

Or, adieu to advice. Recommendations made, we proceed to consider your actual experiment. . . . 130

35

MORE OR LESS SINGLE

Merely nominal celibacy and the principle of common clay. . . . 131

36

ARE PROSTITUTES PEOPLE?

Gratitude, sentimental and otherwise. Physical attraction and mental revolt. The innocence of ignorance. . . . 133

37

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS

Abolition of both in favor of free competition. How you feel about gallant ladies. . . . 136

38

MEMORIES

Mental consequences of physical acts the intelligent objection to promiscuity. . . . 141

39

AMATEUR STANDING

Balancing the score between professional amateurs and amateur professionals. Counterfeits and substitutes. . . . 143

CONTENTS

40

THE WRONG TRACK

Nothing new under the sun. Psychic perversion as a symptom of change. Distinction between oversexed and mentally "intermediate" types. Danger of perversion in emphasis on sex. PAGE 145

41

VARIETIES OF MARRIAGE

Prayer-book classifications are comprehensive but may be mutually exclusive. 149

42

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST

Are women naturally philoprogenitive? Reasons for their prejudice. . 151

43

MOTHER'S DAY

Feminine and masculine views of motherhood. Conflict between prayer-book provisions. Eve disobeys but escapes the curse. 156

44

HAPPY AS HELL

Marriage for comfort none too comfortable and a very bad bargain for you. 161

45

JUST CAUSE OR IMPEDIMENT

Conclusion that courtship for practical purposes ends in the court of domestic relations. The dilemma of two goats. 164

46

MUTUAL HELP

We arrive at romantic marriage by way of the theory of complements. . 165

47

HISTORICAL ROMANCE

When they survived yesterday's pioneers combined all the prayer-book considerations. 167

48

THE NEW PIONEERS

New fields of cultivation threatened by the jungle, but not barren. . . 170

49

ADULT EDUCATION

We are happy in our work when we dearly love our teachers. Self-expression encouraged by intelligent appreciation. 172

50

"STILL FAIR AND KIND AND YOUNG"

Mental as a guaranty of physical accord. No impediment to the marriage of true minds. 175

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

51

OTHER PEOPLE

Outgrowing jealousy. Divorce and the theory of complements. Adulterants and preservatives. Depreciation in the second-hand. PAGE 179

52

A MATTER OF CHOICE

Young idealism and disillusionment. The demands of romance. 184

53

NATURAL SELECTION

Earlier requirements and those of to-day. New qualifications for applicants. 185

54

AUTO-INTOXICATION

Heart throbs no guide to happiness. Advisability of using your head. . . 188

55

SHE WALKS IN BEAUTY

Better to be the judge than the reward of a beauty contest. Points for the connoisseur of loveliness. 191

56

THE MAN WHO MARRIES A DUMB WIFE

Honesty of the procedure. The lowbrow audience. Limited exercise. . . 194

57

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

When woman proposes try not to take it too hard. Feminine finesse under the present system. The compliment of honest approach and honest answer. 196

58

OURSELVES ALONE

Single-minded devotion, professionally religious or religiously professional; also temporary and involuntary. 199

59

VIA SACRA

They who tread the narrow way have still to escape sex consciousness. Effects of prohibition. Medieval social *vs.* modern ingrowing independence. 200

60

THE BEST MAN WINS

His advantage over the bridegroom. Celibate efficiency on the one-man job. The satisfactions of victory. 203

61

WHAT YOU GIVE UP

Physical considerations and medical reports. Ways of having a good time. Liberty of action *vs.* mob psychology. 205

CONTENTS

62

"SOUR GRAPES"

Sublimation universal. Present trends a consolation. But does involuntary celibacy exist? PAGE 208

63

THE PARTING OF THE WAYS

You must make up your mind, for the road forks here. 210

64

WHAT NOT TO DO

Old morality close to mortality. The patriarchal and the matriarchal view. 211

65

MAKING A MORALITY

With a taboo on taboos. Progressive measures based on the unimportance of sex. 218

66

EDUCATING EVE

Reconditioning for women begins with "Honesty is the best policy." Ethics of equality forbid finesse. Practical considerations favoring fairness. . . . 219

67

ACCLIMATING ADAM

Curtailed masculine privileges the price of freedom. A short-cut to sophistication. Misplaced moral advice. Advancement of "the proper age to marry." 225

68

A SINGLE STANDARD

Taste as a moral influence. Strength of the unwritten law. Fear of ridicule. 232

69

CHILDISH THINGS

A last look at the flesh-pots. Physical valuations and emotional deflections. 235

70

SILENCING THE SNAKE

Taste the painless method of emotional control. Its canons and those of our earlier advisers. 239

71

CONSEQUENCES

Enlarging the view by applying the individual solution to humanity in general. 242

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

72

"FAMILY PRIDE MUST BE DENIED"

Facing the Family and stating a few Home truths. Murderous conflict between the generations. PAGE 243

73

STANDING-ROOM ONLY

Suppose the supply of human material were cut off? Diminished? Malthus and his followers do a little arithmetic. 246

74

SUFFER, LITTLE CHILDREN

Questions of quality. *Noblesse* obliges with an heir but not a replica. Heredity and environment *vs.* individual progress. Children as people. . . 251

75

MODERN IMPROVEMENTS

Parenthood by plan instead of by accident. Birth control and self-control. 257

76

CUSTOM-MADE FAMILIES

Children of adoption solve the problems of number, timing and gender. The advantages of a large family when not of home manufacture. 260

77

ALL GOD'S CHILLUN

Pragmatic sanction for retaining the spirit of youth. Is development arrested by sex consciousness? 265

78

RESULTS ABROAD

What would society be without sex? A scientist sketches a possible world. 267

79

"CHERCHEZ LA FEMME"

Sex as a *particeps criminis*. Sex appeal and the jury. Minor offenses. . 269

80

ARMS AND THE CHILD

Sex as a *casus belli*. Population increase and war as an economic necessity. Mars and Venus. 271

81

ADAM'S CURSE

When Adam delved and Eve span both were overworked. Sharing jobs one way to reduce labor. 273

82

NICE PEOPLE

Happy children are good children. Better manners with decreased sex consciousness. 278

CONTENTS

83

LIBERTY

Advantages to society of individual freedom. Creation as the discovery of new ideas. PAGE 281

84

KINGDOM COME

Final consideration of our immortal souls. Progress from the cradle to the grave. Suppressed scripture attacks the last enemy. 284

APPENDIX

Instead of a bibliography. The theory of complements from Plato to Weininger. The theory of equality from Mill to Mathilde and Mathias Vaërtling. Your opportunity to be *very* intelligent. 291

INDEX 303

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE TO MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY

I

"WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?"

ON the occasion of my parents' marriage my grandfather warned the world of the dangers of a vitality which placed nourishment and children first, heaven and hell a rather remote second, and the welfare of society as a whole nowhere. At that time his was a voice crying in the wilderness. Now, however, we have a Wagnerian chorus to declare that the evils which he mentioned are at hand.

Indeed nothing of much value, if you except me, seems to have come from my parents' vital concern with me and with food. And my value has been questioned along with that of all members of the generation to which I belong.

Yet the present generation, if it achieves nothing else, must be given credit for perceiving and proclaiming the illogicality of the old position. We are not contented any more with those employments for our vitality which sufficed our fathers and mothers. Much as we like our food we resent giving our entire attention to obtaining it, and while we are not so critical of the means of obtaining children we are less satisfied with them as an end.

Are we ungrateful because we are not contented? A section of the Wagnerian chorus occupies itself with that accusation, which has greeted every move toward better living since the world began. The first slave who complained about his lot was doubtless reminded that his master was kind; after all he had the priceless boon of existence, and his father had been a slave—did he think he was better than his father? The beginnings of revolt in church

and state are commonly met by protests that we should be respectful toward and satisfied with the present order, which has been endured with equanimity if not with heroism by so many people for so many years. The consent of heaven is assumed always for the existing, never the proposed scheme of things; a Boston clergyman opposed lightning rods because "As lightning is one of the means of punishing the sins of mankind, and of warning them from the commission of sin, it is impious to prevent its full execution." Even efforts to combat disease are still met by inferiority-complex notions that a certain amount of trouble is good for us; we ought to be grateful merely to be alive, and decently acquiescent in death.

But of course I hope and trust that you as an intelligent young man are free from antique scruples regarding change. No doubt you realize that as present conditions were produced by present customs, the only way to improve the conditions is to alter the customs. And having read enough anthropology to know that human society has survived almost every conceivable variation in manners and morals, you are willing perhaps to discuss all means of relief from difficulties which, if you do not perceive them for yourself, will be pointed out to you by alarmed observers on every hand.

I myself intend to point out a number of them as we go along.

True, I realize that being a man you may be a conservative in the matter of children if not in the matter of nourishment. In this age of projected progress men and women have hurled at each other accusations of conservatism when the simple fact seems to be that women are conservatives on the subject of work (art, business, economics) about which they have been trained to know little, while men are standpatters in human relationships. Timidity in strange territory is natural; it is the research worker familiar with the subject who develops radical hopes. Then too, it is a great temptation to be satisfied with the existing order as long as it gives us the advantage, and as women have had the economic advantage of not having to earn a living by the usual

“WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?”

means, so men have had to date the advantage in the job of marriage. It is only of recent years that women have forsaken their easy economic bonds for the heavier if more dignified burdens of economic freedom and responsibility, and men have not as yet perceived, perhaps, that their preferred position in human intercourse implies any serious drawbacks.

But conditions are rapidly coming to a point where conservatism is impossible. Bitter-enders to-day are in the position of the boy who stood on the burning deck. In a more peaceful age Emerson said that life offered a choice between truth and repose; but in these times it is hard to be sure that life itself is certain for the weary-minded. It has come to be believed that life is motion, and the immobility of repose is too easily confused with that of demise.

It is true that mere motion, the physical alternative to repose, is not to be confused with Emerson's alternative of truth. When we contemplate a world whirling rapidly to get somewhere it is unnecessary to visualize it gyrating through all the byways which well-meaning but perhaps hasty prophets may suggest.

Indeed there are strange ideas abroad, so strange some of them that it becomes increasingly difficult to classify people as smugly as we once did. Protests against convention are made alike by saints and sinners; the marriage service, with all orthodoxy, is condemned alike by those who think it too good and by those who think it not good enough.

When we see the old standards attacked, even though we believe that we have progressed beyond them, there is with some of us an impulse to rally round them rather than to go ahead; we are tempted to spend our energies in defense of the ashes of our fathers and the temples of their gods. Particularly are people of taste impelled toward this foolhardy course by the fact that the manners and the graces, the proper bringing-up and the civilized accents are as usual on the side of the nice placid dears who are not only ignorant of what it's all about but even unaware that anything unusual is going on.

And many of us are sentimental enough to hope for a solution which, while dispensing with the universally acknowledged difficulties, will preserve also a view of marriage carried over from the last if not from an earlier century. Now and then there are moments when this generation, overwise and overstale, can hardly conceal its envy of the Age of Innocence. While we are half ashamed to admit the extent of our fascination by things Victorian, actually we look back upon those days of apple orchards and pony-carts and little girls in pantalets and little boys in ruffles, and family albums and ambrosia, with a secret wistfulness quite out of keeping with our free spirits. Those of us whose memories do not go back that far still feel an occasional hankering for pre-war civilization, when travel was travel because we did not know so much inside stuff about the whole world; when home was home because there were flower-beds in the front yard and a wood-pile in the back, and white oilcloth and mother in the kitchen.

But except for the advertising pages of the magazines, where mothers with schoolgirl complexions still frolic in sunny kitchens and wot not of any save mechanical changes, the good old times will not come back. The psychoanalysts and the novelists and even the realistic poets will not let them. They have burst our bubbles, X-rayed our dolls to show the sawdust, made our tin soldiers really fight. We can't go back there any more. We can only go forward.

Perhaps when the whole mess is cleaned up, when we have stormed or surrendered the last conservative stronghold and built a new earth which shall be heaven, we shall be allowed to construct a replica of that old life if it is still the sort of life we want. But not now. Now it is helpful to remember that after all the safest defense is in advance; if the old standards were perfect we might well defend them, but as we did not find them so in the past we should not be any more contented with them in the future.

The fact is that, materially speaking, the materialists have it. We may as well concede them their own ground. When they say

“WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?”

that marriage as we know it is silly there is enough truth in the statement to make it dangerously plausible. When they point out that saying a few words over a man and a woman kneeling together on white satin cushions can not make it either right or wrong for them to live together, they are right. It can not unless there is a law of God to back up the words. The failure of the thing to work out better than it has proves that in many cases God has nothing to do with it. Well, then, says the logical materialist, the law behind it is a law of nature. And why make a religious ceremony out of a purely natural act? Descendants of the generation that has abolished grace before meals will inevitably abolish grace before marriage.

As for meals, we may be practical about them through disinclination to attach too great an importance to a minor function. Perhaps it's as well to save our thanks for the sunrise instead of spending them on the turnips.

But marriage differs from nutrition after all. Though they may seem of equal importance to the individual, whether or not we eat is actually quite unimportant compared with whether or not we marry. Eating or starving is a purely personal matter. But marriage is not. Marriage is bound to affect at least one other person, and it may affect future generations. For this reason it is not to be classed with other physical functions even though the physicists would have us so believe.

And the moment marriage becomes a question affecting the world at large it deserves consideration in the light of religion, science, or whatever deities we acknowledge as responsible.

The most popular of these deities have been understood to confer their joint approval upon the institution of the Home, and attack upon any phase of home life has been considered attack upon the very foundations of our civilization. True, when family life flourished too lushly it might be conveniently reduced by the usual method of a war, but the war must be fought in defense of the Home, and the Home so defended and purified by blood-letting became only a more sacred symbol of heaven.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

In their simplest perfection some homes might have come near the reality, but the Home in general seems not to have attained the ideal largely because people in it failed to become as the angels. The angels we are told neither marry nor are given in marriage, which implies either a celestial completeness of the individual or a unison of souls so apparent that wedlock becomes unnecessary. But the foundation of the Home was often an alliance based on nothing more stable than desire for wealth or position or a pretty pair of ankles. And the object of the Home was the bringing up of children in the image and likeness of the parents, with all the latter's weaknesses. This was formerly considered a worthy end, but of late the ingratitude of the young rascals who grew up to write books like *The Way of All Flesh* has brought about a general feeling that this also is vanity.

Now that, as alarmists observe, the very sanctity of the Home is called in question, people are reverting in their consideration of marriage to the simple and selfish theory of personal happiness, and not forgetting that the subject is one affecting the world at large, it is not at all impossible that we may discover at last that the proper solution for the individual brings the best solution for the world.

2

TRIAL AND ERROR

WE have had of late one definite suggestion, and uninspired as it seems the eagerness with which it has been discussed is an indication of the universal wish to get somewhere. The companionate-marriage idea is unfortunately without the advantage of true novelty. It has been tried for some time; childless couples, more or less dependent on the support of their elders, are nothing new in our civilization, and certainly there is nothing novel in seeing their status altered in a few years either by the advent of children or by a divorce. There's nothing new about companionate marriage except the name, which permits contracting parties to publish abroad what was formerly a point for private conference. In this, perhaps, it

does perform a service by encouraging pre-marital frankness; probably many unnecessary marital trials have been due to a failure on the part of the bride to state that she had no intention of having children, or of the groom to admit that he had no intention of providing for them or for her.

But the most credit you can give the plan is this clarity of name. It has the virtue of a Pure Food and Drugs Act which without prohibiting adulterants insists that the label declare plainly the contents of the bottle. This is doubtless a step forward in its way, though it is a regrettable tendency of the modern pseudo-scientific mind to regard any question as settled when it is labeled.

Indeed we have gone a good way toward settling a problem when we have correctly stated it. But the world's need for real companionate marriage—marriage, that is, which shall make for genuine companionship, satisfying and secure—is in no wise met by a makeshift which carries on its face an open expectation of defeat.

It seems reasonable to suppose that we shall not be able to settle the question quite so easily. It is a big question even if you consider it of no greater importance than the question of nutrition, and it seems unlikely that it should be solved just by giving a new name to practises which even at their best are not quite ideal. Truth, it seems, should be arrived at through more conscious effort.

It is fashionable in these days to try to arrive by experimental methods which we call "nature's method of trial and error," and these methods seem especially popular in the field of morals. In other fields, indeed, they have to some extent been rendered obsolete by the invention of printing, enabling us to take advantage of previous discoveries. In mathematics, in physics, in chemistry we acknowledge that while the methods of questioning nature through experiment may be sound enough, it is a waste of time for every individual to repeat the entire catechism. We willingly go ahead from the point already reached. It is only in

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

matters of right and wrong that we are rejecting, these days, whatever conclusions the past has to offer. There we will find out for ourselves, so we will, and so we begin all over at the very beginning.

But as no individual can possibly perform all the experiments in living it seems necessary to employ reason at least to the extent of deciding what experiments to undertake. They are often mutually exclusive. If, for example, you decide upon the experiment of promiscuous living you must definitely forego the experiment of chastity. If you go in for romance you must eschew the practical, and vice versa. And certainly before we experiment in marriage, a field in which the casualties run high, it would seem the better part of valor to weigh whatever data may be available, consider carefully the materials we have to work with and choose, among various methods of procedure, that one which seems most likely to succeed.

For nature, in her trials, can afford mistakes. She can afford to waste millions of individuals and thousands of years. But we have neither so many lives nor so much time.

A staggering amount of data on the subject of marriage has been amassed by the church, by the various branches of modern science, and by those observers of humanity who embody their discoveries in what is called literature. There are such varied opinions under each of these heads that your only difficulty will be in choosing.

The materials you have to work with as a man are women and love. You also have yourself, but as I do not pretend to know as much about you as you do we shan't go into that just now.

As to methods of procedure the world acknowledges two: marriage and celibacy. These however seem to me to be again divisible into four; for there are at least two broadly differing views of marriage and as many of celibacy.

That is, there is marriage regarded as a practical undertaking to found a home and a family, the other party to the enterprise

CHARTING THE CHANGES

being any one of a number of suitable people of similar intentions, and there is marriage regarded as the romantic union of two persons destined in the eternal scheme of things to complement each other.

There is also celibacy regarded as a state of single blessedness permitting extra-legal intercourse without the bother of family responsibilities, and there is celibacy regarded as a state of devotional chastity.

Moreover, while as I have said certain experiments in living are mutually exclusive it is possible to make successive combinations. General opinion agrees that for men the usual custom is a period of not-too-strict celibacy followed by practical marriage; while for women civilization has hitherto prescribed premarital chastity with marriage a nice blending of the practical and the romantic.

Your own choice of an experimental method must be finally determined by the results you wish for yourself, for your possible family and for society.

There is only one thing of which you must beware at the beginning, in the middle and until the end. That is the tremendous effort of public opinion to standardize your experiment, to smother it, and cramp it, and force it into a groove. If it is to be a genuine experiment you must control it yourself from the start; you must make up your mind without regard for the past, though in the light of past mistakes, and without regard even for present custom except to keep posted on those changes which may influence your experiment.

3

CHARTING THE CHANGES

AT the beginning of even an investigation of the conditions of your experiment, I want to say firmly that, though I have mentioned progress and spoken openly of a new heaven and a new earth, this is not intended as a reform book. It is not written with any intention of revolutionizing the

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

world because that seems quite unnecessary. The world is revolutionizing itself at a rapid rate. The whole assumption of *The Intelligent Man's Guide* is simply that we might move even faster toward the goal we are approaching by devious and unconscious means if we were to try to get our bearings and travel with some idea of whither we are bound.

At the start you are facing a set of conditions—or we might as well call them frankly girls—that no man has ever faced before. You've gone to school with girls (unless you went to a private school), to college with them probably, and now you're going to have to work with them in business and the professions. Whatever you do and wherever you go, as long as you stay within the limits of Anglo-Saxon civilization, you'll be running into women and falling over them and finding them generally in your way.

Men before you were spared this necessity for sharing everything. It's all happened so quickly that while you probably never have known girls who couldn't vote as soon as you did, smoke when you did and behave generally much as you do, your father still thinks it's funny when he sees a girl in a barber's chair, and his father would have had apoplexy at the sight.

Not long ago I read a novel copyrighted in 1883. Would you call that an antique? I wasn't born then and probably you weren't, but still it doesn't seem so far off. Yet a description of a street scene in a bustling American city ended thus: "Sometimes he saw tender women, and that touched the pathetic chord of his heart."

Tender women, pathos at sight of them in the midst of a harsh world! Yes, it's funny; I know it's funny. Women, in fact, knew that such descriptions of them were funny for a long time before the knowledge reached nice men. But you see what a vast amount of ground has been covered by these galloping females since the days when mother was a girl.

Mother, however, began it; not us. The girls you will meet in your world to-day have no more responsibility, as individuals, for their presence here than you have. The changes whose present

WHAT HAPPENED TO BUSINESS

results are shocking so many people began when women first wanted to ride bicycles and go to college and then to work.

And the results of this revolution that mother made may not be pleasing to you. I shouldn't blame you a bit if you weren't delighted with them. I see clearly that while girls are having the fun of exploring new territory men, the previous sole occupants, are in the position of entertaining uninvited guests; guests, moreover, who are not content to remain polite onlookers but may even leave marks on the furniture.

4

WHAT HAPPENED TO BUSINESS

THERE is no reason why men should eagerly welcome an immigrant horde of women into industry, any more than any fairly prosperous native should welcome foreign invasion. My own observation has been that men have taken remarkably well having their sanctums cluttered up with girls giggling or grinding at routine work or, maybe worse, slipping into real jobs.

It's true you won't have much of the last to stand. As yet the good jobs are still controlled by men of that older generation who have the same unpleasant sensation when they see a girl behind a big flat-topped mahogany desk that they feel on seeing her in the barber's chair. The chances are that women won't really compete with you for the real jobs for at least another generation.

Too often, just when a girl is doing nicely, she will suddenly appear with the latest in platinum settings on her third finger, and a disillusioned man higher up will begin hunting another man to take her place. One more example of feminine failure to stick to business? Not necessarily; she may have found a more profitable business opportunity. They may not have paid her quite as much as they would have paid a man for the same work. She may have concluded that it is better to command a man's salary even if it means promising to love, honor and obey the man.

Still you may consider this a mean trick. A girl goes into business, messes it up for men, and stays just long enough to find some boob who's willing to support her. Or, if she stays, she demands as much salary as a man who has to think about supporting a wife and maybe a family. It's not fair, it seems, for a man to find himself married to the old-fashioned woman who demands support while he competes in business with the new-fashioned kind who demands equal pay.

But it may be easier in the future when there are fewer old-fashioned women left to marry. As long as there are any they are, of course, the ones whom you will marry, simply because a specialist always succeeds. The girl who stays at home waiting for her knight to come riding, meanwhile keeping a nice wave in her hair, learning to cook and not spoiling her disposition by the trials of an office will probably be rewarded, unless she is hopelessly inept at seizing opportunities. It may be confidently affirmed that the career of marriage is still open, in America at least, to any girl who determinedly chooses it.

But it's also easy for women to get jobs, small jobs; so easy that those who are just "home girls" are getting scarcer and scarcer. And when the species is entirely extinct men will find themselves, if they only notice it, released from an outrageous burden.

Women who try supporting themselves are now able to guess what a terrific undertaking it must be to support a family. If they have any fairness at all they are coming to see that while it is true men have had all the advantages in business, it is also true that they needed them.

Older men whose very tolerance for the women invaders was based on the assumption that they wouldn't get anywhere belonged, many of them, to that group of American bread-winners frequently reproached for their lack of interest in art and politics, the world at large and the "finer things of life" by wives whose tasks, however temporarily exacting, were still in a sense elastic. Household drudgery is drudgery, but the housekeeper is her own

mistress. She works late but she can take time in the middle of the day for movies, clubs or reading.

Office work, on the other hand, is also drudgery and the office worker is not his own master. Unless he is an executive with the executive's privilege of being temperamental, he must do the day's stint within certain hours. No one who has tried both can fail to realize that working steadily on schedule, even if the work is lighter, is much more wearing than working at varied tasks under one's own direction. Hence the "tired business man."

You, as an intelligent young man who has heard all about Babbitt at an early age, may quite possibly have resolved not to be caught in any such trap. You may have come to look upon office work with an almost feminine distaste, since the distaste is not feminine at all but merely natural to anybody able to survey the situation with detachment. You know that there are other and more interesting things to do in the world than toiling away at a desk. You are excusable for not regarding with unalloyed enthusiasm the prospect of harnessing yourself for years of unremitting toil to pay rent, grocers' bills, doctors' bills, taxes, insurance, and buy the baby's shoes. Such a prospect isn't very intriguing to a sane mind, that is to a mind unaffected by what Mr. Tarkington calls the temporary insanity of love.

The fact is that work as an end in itself can be seen to be losing its appeal. Work for self-support is of course no intolerable burden; whenever we grow sufficiently tired of it we have only to stop eating. That's our own affair. But support of another person is different. To a fair mind it seems unjust to charge any able-bodied adult with the support of another able-bodied adult, whatever the circumstances.

This does not mean that support may not be provided out of generosity, fulfilling the terms of an early contract. But it does mean that in equity support is not due except for services rendered, in which case the support is earned and is given not of grace but of debt.

To put it plainly, if you are not so young a man as I have

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

assumed, and if you promised some years ago to endow your wife with all your worldly goods, to cherish and protect her, it's up to you to carry out that bargain to the best of your ability. But if you're a young man I think you're a bit foolish to give up your chance to see the world and tie yourself down to the support of a mere wife.

The dependence of woman in times past has been based simply on the assumption, in too many cases fact, that she was not able-bodied. That is, she was not able to undertake two forms of labor at once, and the labor of child-bearing incapacitated her for further labor except such light tasks as milking the cows and doing the washing. Seriously, it did incapacitate her for any work requiring constant effort, dependability, perhaps even extra work at a time when she might be below normal activity. It still does incapacitate her from business success in many instances.

Of course the woman who has children and keeps house earns a salary—not only her living expenses but as much more as her employer, who is her husband and the father of the children, can afford. Don't mistake my meaning when I say I think you're foolish to undertake the support of a mere wife. If your wife is also your housekeeper and a nurse and governess, you owe her all you can pay her. But you are not paying her for being your wife; you are paying for a home and the privilege of being a father.

When you contemplate marriage these days you should be quite certain whether you contemplate marriage that merely includes a wife, or marriage that includes all that elastic word may cover. While the economic hazards of supporting a family and maintaining a home would seem sufficient to give any young man seriously to think, it can not be concealed that the rewards of the undertaking have decreased rather than increased.

LET us look at what happened in three generations of one American family of my acquaintance.

The maternal grandmother had eight children, three of whom died in infancy as they often did in those good old days. Her four daughters who reached maturity averaged two children apiece; their six daughters, her granddaughters, have so far averaged only one child each.

Grandmother was married at nineteen. Her daughters and granddaughters managed to average the ripe age of twenty-five before signing any marriage registers.

Grandmother had a fourteen-room house in the country; her daughters had either smaller city houses or still smaller apartments, and her granddaughters the same or less.

Grandmother had no thought of any career other than marriage and motherhood, if you except the fact that she supported two small children by teaching music while grandfather was a Civil War prisoner. But two of her daughters harbored a then unheard-of yearning for a career and actually worked for money before marriage. One kept on working after marriage, and of the six granddaughters five worked before and five have kept on working after marriage.

I mention these details because this is, I believe, a fair picture of how things have been going with ordinary literate Americans during recent generations. And summing up, I think we are justified in concluding that from a material standpoint the present generation gets less out of marriage than its grandparents.

One child instead of eight, and a tiny apartment instead of a big house, are material differences. In terms of home and family we seem to have less excitement. We have other things, no doubt, as compensations or improvements; we have motors and other modern conveniences, and we have travel. But these are things which can be enjoyed by the celibate. What I am trying

to say is that, materially speaking, marriage undoubtedly brings us less.

Even if you wanted to, with the best intentions in the world, you could hardly hope to manage the eight children and the fourteen rooms (with a hundred acres or so of woods and fields) as easily as grandfather did. For, grandmother being nineteen when she married, he was all of twenty, and practising law, and mixing up in state politics at that tender age. Pioneer conditions gave him a running start on you, just as virgin forests made it easy for him to build a big rambling house and add new wings as the family increased.

In those days everybody had a house except the unmarried man who, unless he was wealthy enough to maintain an "establishment" or live at a fashionable club, must stay in a boarding-house or "room" with a family. Now we have abolished most of the distinctions between a home and bachelor's quarters. The unmarried man can have a small apartment with domestic service for less than it would cost him to maintain a slightly larger apartment and a wife, and otherwise there may be no great difference in the domestic arrangements. The comforts of home may turn out to consist of delicatessen food anyhow, as he can find out from his more candid married acquaintances; as for darning, that ancient wifely occupation, there isn't a respectable tailor or laundry that can't do a better job nowadays than most wives. The woman who finds a moth hole in her own coat is apt to have it rewoven at one of the shops specializing in such work, and a large company recently valued at ten million dollars a new invention to repair silk stockings. Specialized service of all sorts has put an end to the monopoly of comfort once held by the home.

Women are shedding few tears over the change. A company manufacturing building materials sought, not long ago, to determine whether the "home nest" held first place in the hearts of women of this era. Let the official in charge of public relations tell his story: "We had a discussion in our office as to whether the desire to own a home originated with the husband or the wife.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE HOME

For three months I checked with every young married woman I met to find out whether she desired to own a home of her own. Practically all of them wanted to live in an apartment near the business center, and most of them wanted to get into business."

While this may seem a regrettable lack of sentiment on the part of the young women it is hard to prove that it was a lack of sense. Certainly it was not a lack of sportsmanship; for houses were never a more expensive load for husbands, housework never easier for wives.

The wife who tries to manage a job and an apartment too must possess an iron constitution and a saintly temper. But the wife who tries to make a man more comfortable than he was before marriage, while being forced to use for her own needs a part of the income he could formerly spend on himself, has no easy task, and if her previous training has been professional rather than domestic she can hardly be blamed for thinking that the answer is money of her own. Modern living conditions for people of ordinary income utterly annihilate the theory that two can live as cheaply as one. In practise, of course, the old-fashioned wife earned her keep "in kind" and her husband simply continued as before marriage to control his money. When women raised "garden sass" and dressed on "chicken money" economic errors were harder to discover; now they announce themselves because there's a calculable weekly difference between one and two oranges for breakfast.

Out of this very brief mention of economic changes there emerge the unavoidable facts of more competition from women on your job, and less comfort at home. You are the victim of both these changes. On the other hand, as I have tried to point out, if you beware of individual gold-diggers, women will in time release your nose from the grindstone as their means of support. And this is no inconsiderable service. But the economic changes are by no means all the changes you have to face. I only mentioned them here for the sake of chronological accuracy. The changes you hear most about have a more spectacular appeal.

OUR grandfathers who objected to girls riding bicycles and going to college and voting because the girls would become rough and wicked like men were not off the track though they may have been headed in the wrong direction. What they prophesied has come to pass, up to a certain point, and to-day observers of short skirts and drinking and swearing and petting inform us in no uncertain terms that the whole of the prophecy will soon be fulfilled. Women will soon be just as bad as men or know the reason why.

The fact is that women in their reach for economic equality have managed to grab not only theoretical political equality (the vote seems nothing much to fight over nowadays) but social equality, which is far more important to most of us. And as in the Old South after the Civil War, it is the social readjustments which cause most difficulty. Because women were supposed to be socially superior to men equality implied, on the surface at least, a step downward. This downward step, you might think, meant only abnegation of feminine privileges, and so was women's own affair if they chose to take it, but not so.

Superiority implied responsibility. Besides the privileges there was the matter of moral guardianship, abdication of which naturally appeared to alarmists as a general lowering of the moral standard.

The alarmist, you see, has harbored a quaint notion that women were the moral leaders of the world; that they are naturally better than men and should avoid all appearance of evil in order to keep men even passably good. You may not have heard of this idea but it's what has been called variously a High Ideal of Womanhood and the Double Standard.

The Double Standard in its fullest expression gave women almost a monopoly of morals, and in its least a handicap in the golfing sense; men were allowed a few slices into the rough, so to speak, as part of their game. You as an intelligent young man

will see at once that this wasn't a compliment; quite the contrary. The assumption was that men hadn't the moral stamina to play the game of monogamy according to the rules set down, and so they were allowed by common consent to cheat. We needn't bother now about placing the blame for this state of affairs; the fact is that many women for selfish reasons encouraged the cheating, or at least shut their eyes to it, while the fact is, too, that many men scorned to take advantage of their special opportunities.

With most intelligent people the Double Standard has come into disrepute, and you will readily see why intelligent women found a change worth while. I have mentioned how, by the romantic moralists, women were made the custodians of all decency and virtue, placed on a pedestal far above the level of mere male humanity. Well, the lady on the pedestal discovered that men said of her "How noble! How pure! How holy!" and, "How different from us," and that the last sentence, by separating her from the exploits, decisions and achievements they had taken upon themselves, effectively rendered her nobility, purity and holiness null and void.

There are more ways of killing a cat than choking it to death with cream, but that remains a perfectly feasible method.

What good did a woman's morals and scruples do if they were regarded as solely her morals and scruples, effective on a pedestal but of no use anywhere else, and certainly to be disregarded in a busy world where men were men? What price holiness and purity if left to her exclusive use? What good did it do to be good when everybody thought you couldn't be anything else? A paragon deserves no credit for being a paragon if that is the nature of the animal.

Woman on a pedestal, regarded as having the goodness and purity of a marble statue, got it at last into her head that she had exactly the influence of a marble statue, a statue's voice in what went on. Sight of her might perhaps inspire an artist or a poet, or provide an orator with a nice allusion, but her opinion meant precious little to the man in the street.

We have somewhat the same situation in religion when by deifying our religious teachers we succeed in making them valueless as examples to mankind. Of course a divinity is going to be good! And, in the same way, until a little while ago men said, "Of course, a woman," and left it at that.

Could you have stood it yourself? Didn't you do the first doubtful things you ever did because somebody intimidated you thought you were too good for such, meaning you were nothing but a sissy boy anyhow?

Not all women were ever good, it's true, but women could be conveniently divided into good women and the other kind. Men paid the good woman homage; then like as not they went out and paid the other one's bills. It was not to be expected that this procedure could be comprehended even if cognized by the good woman; the master of the *Mary Gloster* died firm in his belief that the sort that claimed they could see it weren't "the marrying brand." They were only for going with after lawfully wedded Mary had carried her freight on the last run and earned an early burial, still at sea.

A later generation of womankind was to read *The Mary Gloster*, among other things, and wonder what it was they didn't understand. Is it surprising that, egged on by countless similar allusions, evasions, slippery escapes from her understanding into the mysterious byways of a man's world, woman—as soon as she could earn her fare—stepped down from the clouds to go on a slumming trip?

Her efforts to bend down instead of step down, to find out what it was all about merely by asking, had been met so often with the assumption that she couldn't understand. The answer to *The Mary Gloster* was written forty years before and called *Any Wife to Any Husband*. But outside the ladies' Browning clubs it didn't get much attention.

Now you at any rate don't have to be told that the pedestal days are over. You know better than to think, I hope, that girls are naturally any better than you are. They may have been

THE STATUE GOES ON A BUST

trained for generations to be better, so that even now when they try to cut loose from all restraint they don't quite make the down grade. But they are trying so hard to learn about everything that sometimes they not only believe the worst, they believe a worst actually worse than the real worst is. You've probably noticed it. Still, give them time—another generation or two—and they'll be right where they're determined to be, which is in on the ground floor.

Or perhaps even lower. Men, believing that "The sin ye do by two and two ye must pay for one by one," have appeared anxious to make perdition a refuge from female society. But in these days the unsociable male is forced to say to the persistent lady as the Psalmist said to the Lord, "If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there."

And however he may grieve for her lost innocence, however he may resent her crashing in where she wasn't wanted, however he may wish her back on a nice safe elevation, never will your son or your grandson be able to say of a woman "Sh! She doesn't understand."

There are, I admit, drawbacks in this from the masculine point of view. No doubt it took the kick out of cigarettes for you when you saw girls smoke them too; not that it stopped calm enjoyment of a good smoke, but the little fillip of fun there is in doing something you alone can do. The Boy Scouts who petitioned their mothers to stop smoking had, I think, a legitimate grievance in that they had been deprived of the pleasure of sneaking out behind the barn and consuming their first thrilling masculine cigarette. It can't be so good simply to steal mother's.

Then you will have to search far and wide before you find a girl who can be worshiped as an angel or even revered as a saint, if this is what you want in exchange for your provision of food and clothes and shelter. You may find girls willing to undertake such a rôle if they feel it is what you require, but you as an intelligent man will see discrepancies in their apparel, behavior and mental attitude which suggest **their** unfitness for the part.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

On the other hand, though you are denied this inspiration to better efforts, you can at least rest assured that no girl is preening herself on her superiority to you. By refusing responsibility for your behavior these girls who wear your bathing-suits and slickers and underwear, who smoke your cigarettes and copy your hair-cut, are releasing you from spiritual swaddling-clothes and giving you a chance to be just as good as they are. In return for their infringement of your monopoly of vice they offer a fair share in their monopoly of virtue.

And now having warned you of the worst, it may help if I remind you that to most modern minds the distinction between morals and manners is very slight, and many of the so-called changes in the former are, after all, mere differences in the latter.

7

HONI SOIT . . .

NOT long ago a gentleman complained in print that a girl who used to sneak up an alley to fasten a garter now fastened it in the street. He saw this as a sign of moral decadence. Whether there has been decadence of taste may perhaps be debated, but I hope you are not to be deceived by the notion that a morality dependent upon propriety in dress is a very stable or desirable sort of morality.

You can't of course tell about the girl with the garter; she may be taking advantage of changed customs to display a pretty knee, quite as kittenishly as she might have displayed a pretty ankle in the days of crinolines. On the other hand she may actually believe that to a sane mind a person fastening a garter is not an object of grace, or attraction, or the least interest.

This matter-of-fact view-point about physical matters is one heritage of the war which bids fair to be useful. Philosophers ever since Plato have preached disregard of the body, even disregard of clothes, since no display can equal tender swathing as an emphasis. Yet it remained for the John Held flapper to go almost as far as the Shavian ancients in *Back to Methuselah* in dispens-

ing with extra apparel, and by powdering her nose in public to disabuse mankind of any notion that it just grew lily white. Her reward of course has been to be called shameless (which indeed she is) by people who fail to observe that a sex-conscious lady in twelve yards of opaque material may be twice as appealing as a skinny young thing in a one-piece bathing-suit with her mind on swimming, and that the public use of cosmetics renders them innocuous as lures.

For women to discard the clothes and customs which were often not merely a symbol of their charm but the charm itself may seem like lunacy. Indeed the way women have in recent years swapped priceless privileges for plain bread-and-butter rights will perhaps go down in history as the most remarkable of all self-denying ordinances. But your intelligence may suggest to you that it wasn't so unselfish after all.

The fact is that women grew tired of being women because of certain unfortunate classifications of women with idiots, criminals and so on which were brought to light during the agitation for suffrage that occurred in our mothers' day. As men have always been rather proud of being men this may seem foolish, but I can prove it in a hundred ways. Address an envelope to a woman, calling her Mr. Brown when she is Miss or Mrs. Brown, and she won't mind at all. A man, on the other hand, is apt to think it's odd if you address him as Miss or Mrs. Again, describe a coat as cut on masculine lines and women will very likely flock to buy it, but try telling men about garments built on feminine lines and see how far you get. As for ideas, I wouldn't be at all surprised if women read this book, though it's plainly addressed to you.

Let's just settle it all at once by saying that you wouldn't want to be a girl—you know you wouldn't—while I shouldn't so much mind being a man if I could be the kind of man I'd like to be.

Most women, however, don't go so far as to wish they were men. They want, if they think about things at all, to be considered as individuals. They are willing enough to be attractive and magnetic and charming on their own account, but they are fed

up on having certain privileges—along with certain limitations—handed them because they are females.

By using typical slave tactics of flattery and artful complaint it's usually easy for a woman to make up for any actual weakness, but the intelligent woman has come to doubt the wisdom, not to say the fairness, of winning that way. She has learned at last not to be pleased by the Johnsonian attitude of mind that makes a fuss over her accomplishments because, as the generous Doctor said, the spectacle of a woman preaching deserved notice for the same reason as the spectacle of a dog walking on his hind legs—not because it was well done but because it was done at all. Intelligence observes a similar doubtful compliment attached to all trophies awarded to a woman instead of to a human being. Hence a growing feminine distrust of sex appeal. Common sense, sharpened by experience, warns a woman capable of learning anything that she can't get away with rights and privileges too.

In business she has discovered that the penalties of being considered always as a woman exceeded the rewards. A pretty girl might vamp her boss and get away with it, but not always and not for very long. And so women who went into business with any idea of sticking at it learned to say silently to their associates by their dress and speech and manner, "We'll turn off the sex-appeal stuff if you'll play fair too and not penalize us because we're not men."

So fearful have women become of this penalizing that many of them oppose the laws which seek to give women special consideration in industry on the grounds of simple physical needs. And there actually are two sides to the case. It may work out better in the long run to fight the idea of physical disability along with the other aspects of inequality.

While we are on this phase of the subject it may be interesting to note actual physical changes which have taken place in women almost within our own memories.

WOMEN—educated Nordic women at least—are growing taller, slimmer, stronger, fleeter. You may think this is all outside appearance due to change in fashions, but it isn't. Ask the gym instructors in women's colleges; ask the musical-comedy producers who train choruses; ask the shoe clerks who must persuade girls nowadays to take slippers from one to three sizes larger than those their mothers wore.

The change doesn't show in the large because changes in native American stock have been swamped, in recent years, by the influx of immigration. (We can't tell much about the birth-rate for the same reason.) But commercial straws show which way the wind blows. Manufacturers, for example, vary dress sizes with the quality of the dress, the shorter garments in cheap styles selling in quantities to girls of foreign parentage, or at least unable to attain with leisure and college athletics the height that is rapidly becoming a class distinction. Similarly shoe dealers sell only high heels to the cheap trade, but find a demand for lower heels among their better-class customers.

In line with this physical freedom is the fact that, whatever passing fashions have been, the general style trend since the war has been toward comfort and simplification. All the recommendations as to simplified clothing for women made by a writer in 1916* have come true with one exception: he recommended plain hats trimmed only with flowers. Women have omitted flowers.

For glorified girls of the next century Mr. Ziegfeld recently prophesied the following dimensions: "Height, 5 feet, 10½ inches. Hips, 33 inches. Bust, 36 inches. Waist, 27 inches. Weight, 132 pounds." In case you don't visualize the result, he explains that these young ladies will be taller and more slender through the hips, though wider through the shoulders, than girls to-day.

*W. L. George, *The Intelligence of Woman*.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

This trend isn't all accident. It is partly, at least, an example of mind over matter, or what my grandfather has called conscious evolution. Women first confined figures built on the voluptuous Rubens style because they wanted to be slim. Then they grew slim. They wore high heels because they wanted to be tall. They grew tall. Philosophical query: does all change have to go through the phase of artificial restriction, uncomfortable and awkward forcing, before we arrive at the natural ideal?

9

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

YOU can not, being intelligent, fail to notice one resemblance common to all the changes I have mentioned. In business, in morals and manners, even physically, women are becoming more and more like you.

You didn't invite or even encourage them to do this. They are changing nowadays on their own initiative, though in times past they have responded to your every gesture.

Indeed, so well have they responded that during all these years in which women have been trying to lead you onward and upward they have had an eye out to make sure that was what you wanted. The good woman as well as the other one might truthfully have said, "You've made me what I am to-day, I hope you're satisfied." Millions of women flocked to read a magazine edited for them by a man who confessed that when he began to edit it he had no confidence in his own knowledge of women. He concluded in the end, I believe, that he did understand them because they bought his magazine. But to judge by the views set forth in his writings, he never understood women at all. He merely provided a singularly obvious and simple standard of masculine preference which women were happy to study and even to follow for as long as it seemed to their advantage.

And though I say that they are changing nowadays on their own initiative, if you have any ideas or ideals you wish to impose I'm sure you will find that women, even the most modern and

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

intelligent ones, still want your approval. They will be willing to cooperate in anything you suggest, provided of course that you are willing to try it yourself. I'm afraid that like troublesome children they have outgrown the infant ingenuousness of doing as you tell them and reached a determination to do as you do. After all, in saying defiantly "I'll be as bad as you" the intelligent modern woman does not so much achieve liberty of action for herself as impress upon you your obligations.

You may shrink from the duties of an exemplar. But why shouldn't you devote some attention to the human relationships? You have delegated them to the management of women for some centuries, but they could hardly have been worse managed. Now, while women are learning about socialism and capitalism and the other isms of your world, is your chance to try your hand at molding human lives.

Of course to do much with them you'll have to try to understand women. And however the changes in tradition may confuse you, I assure you there is one infallible rule, discovered by my grandfather: think what you yourself would think if you were in the woman's place. It's useless trying to understand the feminine mind as if it were a peculiar sort of mind. You need only understand feminine circumstances, feminine training and plain human vanity and human needs.

And to-day in spite of all the pother about her changes I suspect that the modern woman is going through no more than the modern young man who breaks the news to the family that he'd rather paint a picture or write a novel than make a cool million in hardware.

So with your leave, though I said that the materials of your experiment were women and love, I do not propose any special consideration of the characteristics of women as such. Their side of the case will naturally develop as we discuss other subjects—love, for instance. Having given to your clothes and your ways that sincerest form of flattery, imitation, they are still touchingly interested in your affections, as these plaintive lines

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

by a modern lady poet,* entitled *The Modern Woman to Her Lover* will attest:

"I shall not lie to you any more,
Flatter or fawn to attain my end—
I am what never has been before,
Woman—and Friend.

"I shall be strong as a man is strong,
I shall be fair as a man is fair,
Hand in locked hand we shall pass along
To a purer air:

"I shall not drag at your bridle-rein,
Knee pressed to knee shall we ride the hill;
I shall not lie to you ever again—
Will you love me still?"

IO

FALLING IN LOVE AND FALLING OUT

IN the fairy-stories we all read when we were very young the happy ending included two things—love and money. The prince and the princess, because they were prince and princess, never had to worry about where the rent was to come from. And of course they fell in love with each other.

As we grew older we perhaps divided our reading, and you, as an intelligent boy, found interesting the stories of how fame and fortune were won by heroes who battled their way up from the bottom, just as most girls devoured romantic accounts of heroines whose difficulties were all smoothed out when they said "Yes" to the right man in the last chapter.

And as an intelligent adult you must have noticed how all grown-up books with happy endings supply either success in some line of endeavor or emotional security as a condition for happiness. It seems we do not outgrow our feeling that both money and love are included among the requisites for unhampered living.

*From *Collected Poems* of Margaret Widdemer.

LOVE: FIRST QUALITY

Just as a short time in the adult world convinces us that making money is not quite so easy as we imagined it in our younger and more hopeful days, so we soon learn too that love isn't always such a simple matter as it seemed. But the parallel ends too soon; for while financial responsibility is urged upon us and we are invited to study how to make more money, the same is not true of love. There are budgets to show us how much money we need, and how we ought to spend what we have. But nobody except the children in the old song has measured our love to show us; nobody with any authority tries to tell us why we need it or what we should do with it. Yet we can hardly hope to acquire a reasonable competency in love until we know what that competency is and how we intend to manage it. It does not seem to be, in all cases, a lifetime investment, and there are those who complain of its low dividends.

It seems too that there are different sorts of love. Perhaps an inquiry into their nature will determine its value.

II

LOVE: FIRST QUALITY

SINCE we noticed a parallel desire for riches—that is, a desire for the wherewithal to obtain food and clothing—it may be helpful to compare the two desires. Food, we believe, makes us physically comfortable, and it also supplies us with strength and energy for work. Just so, without excessive sentiment, we may be said to be made comfortable and encouraged to put forth our best efforts by love. The kind of love may vary from the applause of our associates to the movie-reel variety, just as some people look for sustenance to garlic while others prefer chocolate éclairs, but the principle is the same.

Love is, again, comparable to clothing. Most of us seem to have come into this world lacking what might be called a spiritual skin; we are, that is, so extremely sensitive—conceal it as we may—that we feel the need of love of some sort to cushion the harshness of life. Love protects budding egos and bolsters

wilted self-esteem. The intimate connection between our vanity and our affections can be seen in the way we all think first of the people who love us when we are in trouble or embarrassed, as in the way we try to retain the good opinion of those we love by concealing our faults.

And though we may find it useful in emergencies, the fact is that most of us find the love of our families insufficient to save us. Family love is taken for granted; we know that our relatives have to stand us, and their living with us conveys no assurance because it is through no obvious choice. If we fail in other directions we may take refuge in the unfailing devotion of a mother or a sister, but it's hard to believe that "mother-complexes" are ever developed except by supersensitive souls who flee to mother at the first rebuff.

For with the development of individual character and independence that is ordinarily supposed to mark the end of childhood and the beginning of adult life (as if children hadn't as much character and independence as anybody) comes the necessity to discover approval of ourselves in the eyes of some complete stranger, bound to us by no ties of duty or family relationship.

Traditions which have influenced us from infancy usually impel us to seek this approval from a person of opposite sex. In addition to the obvious explanations of psychology for the triumph of these traditions over pre-adolescent gregariousness, we may observe that as most of us have been taught to regard creatures of the other sex as strange and dangerous animals, taming one of them to our friendly advances is naturally more of a triumph and so more interesting and satisfying to us than simple association with other creatures like ourselves.

It is easy to see then how the growth of this necessity with the connivance and, indeed, the insistence of civilization brings at last all the yearnings which we have come to associate with what we call romantic love, ending in a wish for physical possession.

At first, to be sure, we may be, as innocent children, contented with sight of the person whose approval we desire; that is,

LOVE: FIRST QUALITY

of that person whom we have selected as most desirable and therefore best fitted for the rôle of appreciating us. For while our longing for approval may seem a kind of modesty, we are never too modest to feel that we may earn the admiration of the very nicest people.

As perhaps we may, since our stock-in-trade normally includes not only our own endearing young charms but a supply of that commodity we seek. For just as our selfish and imperfect and weak and greedy egos prompt us to reach out for love for our protection and sustenance, so do our so-called "better natures" prompt us to give love to other people. Just as we wish to receive love from the best sources, so we are impelled to select nice people as recipients of this gift. When we really admire people our wish to do something for them blends with our wish to have them appreciate us; we resolve to improve ourselves at once so that they may admire us, and the whole result is love in as pure and useful a state as we are apt to know it. To him that hath shall be given.

It is this fair exchange of love, with accompanying mutual improvements, which religions commend, which even the ir-religiously ethical commend, and which, to put it plainly, makes life bearable and interesting. We may call it the grace of God, or by a printer's error make it the grease of a mechanistic universe. Either way it is indispensable. We can only be happy in this world by liking the world, seeing in it some people worthy of our admiration and attention and exertion—if not everybody then a few people, or for the Airedale minds at least one person. And we can only make work endurable by doing it in the eyes of the people we admire, hoping for their approval, stirring ourselves to finish it so that we may show it to them.

We do not have to go back to the age of chivalry to see how the urge not only for achievement but for self-improvement and all progress has its origin in our wish to please our chosen associates. To-day manufacturers buy expensive advertising space to tell you how to win your girl's approval by keeping your hair

slick, and your socks gartered, and learning French by correspondence, just as they promise her happiness in the sunshine of your smile when she has used the right mouth wash, and the most becoming shade of powder over a skin you'll love to touch. Thus considered, love becomes not only food and clothing but a valuable stimulant to the change which is creation.

At the beginning of our adventures we are usually occupied with these efforts at improvement; we count it enough reward to bask in the smile of the selected person, and to smile back. We find sufficient pleasure in revealing our character bit by bit, or at least those parts of our character which seem likely to stand inspection best. And in those early essays at companionship which we make at first the element which we call passion is so happily absent that we all look back upon first love as idyllic, though at the time our tender vanity may have found it a state of acute misery.

But the self-justification idea goes further. In time it demands physical intercourse—another person's willingness to take on our fleshly limitations, share even our bodily view-point as the only means whereby true appreciation of us can be demonstrated. And right here we usually get into trouble. We reach, that is, a point concerning which we have no experience to guide us; for nothing in our previous relationships has shown us how to meet this occasion.

12

LOVE: SECOND RATE

I HAVE tried to indicate in the foregoing paragraphs what might be termed the legitimate approach to love. It was, I believe, a fairly representative approach for nice young people once upon a time. But changes in our customs now make it entirely possible that a child brought up on tabloid newspapers and motion-pictures should have a different approach; should, in fact, see different signification in the very word which in his experience is commonly prefixed by head-line writers to the word "nest."

Nor is the noun alone corrupted; a writer of "true confessions" has testified to his discovery that in addressing a certain type of mentality the verb carries a signification amazing to the pure in heart and so far undetected by the censor. To this mind it seems the sentence, "He loved me and I loved him even though we were not married," is definite avowal of a maiden's moral downfall, and to say, "He loved me on the front porch" is not a silly sentence but a sensible explanation of the circumstances of seduction.

It is of course unnecessary to point out to an intelligent reader further evidence that a general confusion regarding the nature of love does exist. It always has existed. It is not only our own generation which has prostituted the word; in the time of King James it was in such ill repute that New Testament translators made Saint Paul talk of charity when he had love in mind.

It is unnecessary just now to go into the morality of the question, but let us look for a moment at the practical difficulties of the less reputable variety of love. People absorbed by this sort of love do not go in for self-improvement. Instead, they develop wants which are definitely connected with time and space, and thus are what the philosophers call material. Opinions may differ as to the desirability of material things, their solidity and permanence, but there can be no doubt that time-and-space limitations are by their nature bound to give us trouble.

Consider the time limitation. A writer of current realistic fiction explains, in his autobiography, that his marital failure was due to the fact that he waited to marry until he could afford an apartment. By that time he was no longer interested.

That is, it is generally admitted that if this sort of love is not satisfied immediately it will spoil. But how often is it impossible to satisfy immediately love that requires material expression! It is not always apartments. The lady may be willing to marry you at once, but you must have a license and a priest; or she may be willing to flee with you without benefit of clergy, but you must stop to buy railway tickets and pack a bag. Perhaps they

manage it better in Polynesia, but you, as an intelligent man, will have too many interests here to move there at once.

The time limitation works another way: as this sort of love will not keep if unsatisfied, neither will it keep if satisfied. Trying to keep it is like trying to keep ice-cream; it just naturally tends to melt. Its essence in fact is *wanting*, and we cease to want what we have. Also to all material objects time brings loss of beauty, loss of charm and eventual decay.

After time limitations come space limitations. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and so with the spirit of man, but not so with too, too solid flesh. You can not love a person, in the confession-writer's sense, in that person's absence any more than you can eat a ham sandwich in the absence of the sandwich. You may want the sandwich very badly but if it is not there it is not there, and thinking of it will not bring you happiness but the reverse. Until we learn to fly without airplanes space limitations will remain space limitations, and the more we concentrate on material desires the longer it must be before we acquire wings. Pigs do not have them.

There are, of course, any other number of material limitations: disease, for example, which can turn an object of fleshly love into an object of fleshly loathing, and the ultimate of disease, death. Remove all merely legal or religious or moral objections to material love, and these limitations will remain—fixed by its own conditions, inherent in its materiality.

The fact is that the world has been finding out through long experience the limitations of this sort of love, and if we were able to begin as individuals where race-knowledge leaves off—*si*, as they say, *jeunesse savait, ou si vieillesse pouvait*—we should none of us be led astray by it. Speaking for the world at large, the wonder and the mystery began to fade from physical love when men made the first discoveries about physical construction; Harvey dealt it a terrible blow, Darwin and Huxley another, and two of our own contemporaries named Steinach and Voronoff finished the job.

When you look intelligently at the difficulties you would think that people would flee from this sort of love, shun it as the plague. But the facts are otherwise. This affliction does not see itself as an affliction and wish sensibly to be cured; it seeks rather a definite material object by which it trusts to turn misery to ecstasy. A fever patient is usually wise enough, between spells of delirium, to wish to be normal as well as to wish for a drink of cool water and an iceberg. But the lover wants only the material object.

At least we who are at present sane may decide that if love is really no more than common knowledge, common imagination and common experience tell us, it hardly seems worth the attention it has received from the best minds, and the very convincing description of its waning given by my grandfather in *Back to Methuselah* should prove a final pronouncement.

The reason, however, that indulgence is accorded this unpleasant variety of love is that it assumes, with the name, the virtues belonging to the respectable and helpful variety mentioned first. Plato, who described both kinds very accurately, points out that "this similarity of name causes all the difficulty and obscurity." It would be easy enough to settle the question if we could draw a sharp line between the kinds of love and recognize each at sight. The whole task of philosophy is to find out how to unscramble the mixture so that we may cast aside the undesirable and retain the genuinely valuable constituents.

There have been efforts to define the first sort of love as the love that gives, and the second as the love that takes. The difficulty here is that selfishness varies with circumstances and the individuals concerned. Philosophy has also discovered that one kind is primarily mental or spiritual while the other is material, and the difficulty here is that mental and spiritual forces are rarely, to our eyes, wholly detached from material conditions. Most modern people refuse to locate their heaven too far away from earth.

Finally there are people who observe that while real love may extend to friends and acquaintances and strangers and even

relatives, the selfish and dangerous form of love is always love between men and women. In some times and places people with this view have been powerful enough to lock up women as menaces to the public morals. In our own time you will find those who assume that there are several kinds of love according to relationship; that the love of parents for their children and the love of country are kinds superior to what they call romantic love.

But the unflattering discoveries of psychology as to human egotism even threaten the position of these loves. The "taking" element is in them too; we begin by taking from our parents, and when we take unconsciously as children this may be very well, but as soon as we begin to look for favors that relationship is spoiled. As parents we take again if we look for awe or slavish obedience or even unquestioning respect and admiration from our offspring. Love of country, exemplified in political and military patriotism, has also lost caste.

However, there are to be considered those psychologists who attribute all forms of human bondage, including the parental and civic, to sexual maladjustments. And though we may sensibly deny that selfish love is confined to love between men and women, and that all love between them is selfish, it seems true enough that the selfish element in such love is commonly connected with sex. Sex, that is, is the lever used to get what we want in such relationships.

Think of a selfish woman; you will think at once of her taking from men because she is a woman. I, I confess, can not think of a selfish man without seeing him exerting masculine prerogatives. Feminists, I regret to say, sometimes speak of "masculine selfishness" as glibly as dyed-in-the-wool southerners speak of "damyankees," and I notice that men are less and less blind to feminine depredations in the way of alimony or other forms of parasitism.

This is philosophically sound if we accept Plato's definition of real love as attraction between those of similar nature and counterfeit love as the attraction of opposites. Under this definition love

SEX DIFFERENCES AND THEIR CAUSES

between men and women can be safe and sound and kind only as it grows out of a sympathy that disregards sex differences; while attraction based on sex, being in itself the acknowledgment of dissimilarity, is selfish and tyrannical.

Here at last we have, perhaps, a real distinction. But what of the fact observed before that, in choosing nice people as the objects of our affection, we have also the inclination to concentrate upon those of opposite sex? Is this question of sex, the distinguishing feature of a love that is admittedly dangerous, a necessary feature of love of a better character?

We have now to consider what is at present the most advertised subject in the world.

13

SEX DIFFERENCES AND THEIR CAUSES

SEX is fundamentally a physical characteristic and for this reason it must be, to an intelligent person, fundamentally unimportant.

To be sure it has a great borrowed importance. Anything that occupies so large an amount of public time and thought demands further consideration for that very reason. If the world were to concentrate on ears, say, with equal intensity, ears might become for us the greatest thing in the world. If we could only believe long enough that upon our hearing depended not only our own happiness but the fate of the human family; if down the centuries this belief had given to our ears a great mystery, sedulously fostered by oral tradition and literary folderols; if we had been taught to think that the keenest delight as well as the greatest misery must come to us through hearing; if we had been warned that we must be very careful what we listened to, only to have new preceptors come along and tell us that our success, indeed our whole safety and sanity depended upon promiscuous eavesdropping; if we had considered it good form to keep the ears modestly hidden, only to have a new fashion decree that they must be prominently displayed . . .

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

If all this had happened this discussion would probably be about ears.

Keeping in mind the auricular comparison, the position of any person arising in the midst of general ear excitement to remark that perhaps ears weren't everything after all can well be imagined. Such a heretic would immediately incur the scorn not merely of radio experts, singers, phonograph and automobile-horn manufacturers, ear surgeons, professional ear wigglers, scientists engaged in proving man's kinship with the ass, and venders of ear-muffs—not merely the legitimate and understandable objections of these, but also the contumely of the general public proud of possessing its most important sense.

Nevertheless, I ask you as an intelligent man to agree with me that sex is no more sacred a mystery to-day than it was when our savage ancestors danced round a totem and made bloody sacrifices to the spirits of the corn and of the wild.

Both savage and civilized rites do however affect the mind of the performer, and it can hardly be denied that if we have a great and innocent belief in the importance of sex, together with an honest regard for the other person inevitably concerned, physical intercourse can be, and must often have been, a process of exaltation, a mystical sacrament consecrated by our faith. But the same exaggeration must make it in other cases the greatest of degradations, and in any event there must be some confusion and disappointment when we identify ourselves so definitely with the body which is so small a part of us and which we must ultimately forsake.

I hope you will bear with me for a moment here if I seem to speak disrespectfully of the body. As a man you probably find your body less a handicap than a useful servant which you have no wish to hear disparaged. But as an intelligent man you will agree with me that when you put yourself on a level with even the best servants they are apt to get out of hand. So with the body; it does very well as long as you keep it in its place. But

SEX DIFFERENCES AND THEIR CAUSES

if you begin treating it as an equal and humoring it and consulting its preferences it will soon get the best of you.

And by you I mean the real you—your mind or, if you prefer the old-fashioned word, your soul. You may tell me that you know nothing about your soul or your mind, but you do know that you are six feet of flesh and bone and muscle, that you weigh one hundred sixty pounds and have blue eyes. To which I, as a writer, must reply that I do not know you at all and can not hope to reach you, for I know of no way of establishing any connection between the words I thump out on a typewriter and a hundred and sixty pounds of what a cannibal would call meat. I can not, for example, assume you to be any less intelligent if you have red hair, or if you happen to wear glasses, or if you lost an arm in the war. Unless you are willing to become, while you read this book, a mind which employs its accompanying body—a hand to hold the volume, eyes to look at the pages—but is not influenced by that body, we may as well part company now.

The fact is that physically we are all so much alike that for all ordinary purposes of life it is convenient to assume that we are exactly alike. That is, this assumption has been made generally for men and generally for women, and is coming to be made generally for humanity by those who point out that the so-called secondary sexual characteristics are not so much sexual distinctions as differences due to training.

Dr. Paul Bousfield writes in *Sex and Civilization*:

“Many of the secondary characteristics of a physical kind which have been regarded as belonging to the male or female sex have been shown to be not nearly so distinctive as has been expressed. They depend as much on other internal secretions as on those associated with the sexual glands. Evidence tends to show that many of these so-called secondary characteristics, such as the general disposition of fat, muscular strength, and so forth, are probably of an adventitious nature and depend on other factors more than on the sexual glands,

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

"Historically this is confirmed, since in many races, both past and present, women have been stronger and bigger than men."

The popular Dr. Joseph Collins says the same thing in *The Doctor Looks at Love and Life*:

"Experiments would seem to indicate that what has been a suspicion in the minds of scientists for some time will soon be proved fact, viz., that there is small difference between the two sexes. . . . The anatomical differences on first consideration seem tremendous but at the last analysis they are not. . . . There is apparently great psychological difference as evidenced by behavior but it is not an inherent one. If male and female children were brought up in exactly the same way, subject to the same experiences, suggestions, surroundings, society, this behavioristic difference would diminish."

Now we have got somewhere, for training is not a matter of body but of mind.

14

MENS SANA

THERE is no sex in mind.

But as we said of the subject at large, the mental aspect of sex is important because we have made it so. As with travel in the age before Columbus, popular belief even though erroneous hampers movement.

At birth the physical difference of sex is the first thing noted about a child, and from that moment the life of the individual is predicated on this difference. If we were classified by pigmentation and brought up as brown- or blue-eyed persons, by opposite and artificial codes, it would require no complicated knowledge of psychology to perceive that we might eventually divide the world into two camps of Blue-Eyes and Brownies, with appropriate marked characteristics and an intricate system of behavior.

And this is in fact the whole situation between men and women. Classified at once by anatomical structure we are brought

up on the Mother Goose conception that little girls are, or should be, made of sugar and spice and all things nice and attractive, while little boys must manage the rougher constituents of scissors and snails and puppy dogs' tails.

Like certain tribes whose customs have been charted by the anthropologists, we do not even speak the same language.* Much as we pride ourselves nowadays on our free speech, we have only succeeded in removing taboos on certain words and subjects; we have not made sure at all that we shall mean the same things by them. For we have also been educated into different moral and social codes. As Stevenson put it in an essay which contains so much truth that it's too bad we are blinded to it by its inclusion in college requirements: "It is the object of a liberal education not only to obscure the knowledge of one sex by another, but to magnify the natural differences between the two. . . . They are taught to follow different virtues, to hate different vices, to place their ideal, even for each other, in different achievements. . . . What the boy does almost proudly, as a manly peccadillo, the girl will shudder at as a debasing vice; what is to her the mere common sense of tactics, he will spit out of his mouth as shameful."†

I have, of course, no first-hand knowledge of your training, but I do know how girls are brought up, and you can draw your own conclusions as to the difference when I tell you that while parents and schools may be sensible the whole weight of public opinion, as expressed variously from the comments of acquaintances to the conclusions of magazine or screen, still assures a girl in Byronic terms that "love is woman's whole existence."

*"The island Caribs have two distinct vocabularies, one of which is used by men and by women when speaking to each other, and by men when repeating, in *oratio obliqua*, some saying of the women. Their councils of war are held in a secret jargon into which women are never initiated. The men and women have separate languages, a custom which is noted also among the Guycurus and other peoples of Brazil. . . . The Arawaks have words which only men may speak, and others which only women may speak." Sumner, *Folkways*.

†From *Virginibus Puerisque*.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Remember that a difference in training argues no essential difference in character, no insurmountable obstacle to understanding. But you must make allowance for it in your dealings.

Woman told to make love her whole existence does so just as a man makes work his whole existence, because it is pointed out as her proper job. It is not lack of attention but strict attention to business as usual that makes a girl read a romantic novel on the subway while the man at her elbow is absorbing export duties. And human intercourse is really, when you come to think about it, neither less complicated nor less important than correspondence-school instruction sheets.

The trouble has always been in dividing the job and then assuming that the difference is irrevocable. An unintelligent man who laughs at his wife for reading the society page instead of the market reports is the very sort to insist that woman's place is in the home. Such a person thinks that his wife's choice of reading proves his point, when it only proves that she has given too much attention to the idea he advances, and the ideas of his father, his grandfather and his great-grandfather before him.

(I trust you won't mind what I say of men like this, for you know they do exist. Theirs is the type of mind that orders a band to play *Oh, You Beautiful Doll* when a woman in a nice frock rises to address a national convention. Theirs also is the Sunday-supplement variety of science that points to feminine variation in dress as a sexual characteristic, disregarding not only natural and human history but the force of tradition which diverts feminine artistry to self-adornment.)

But it's no earthly good blaming men for what women are, any more than blaming women for what men are. We all have to take our share of blame both for what we are and for what we encourage other people to be. And the worst blame of all is due for saying that as we are so we must remain.

The whole theory of democracy is that people can learn. Your democrat doesn't, or shouldn't, say, "That ditch digger will make a better president than that Princeton graduate." He says,

60

"It should be admitted that with the proper education a man whom circumstances now force to be a ditch digger might conceivably make a better president than a Princeton graduate." There is, in short, nothing of an irrevocable nature about the ditch digger's shortcomings. The existing distinctions must be admitted; it is the conditions responsible for these distinctions which are wrong and should be abolished.

Similarly your sex-democrat, abolitionist of sex-distinctions, says not that men and women are now exactly the same, but that their differences are due to a mutual tyranny existing over some centuries but nevertheless wrong and in need of abolition.

The change will come when we stop talking about the differences between us and begin to analyze one another's problems. My grandfather really began that process when he remarked in a preface that if women were as fastidious as men human creation would long ago have ceased. With the same observation it might be said that if men were as unenterprising—as lazy, to be frank—as women along commercial, professional and military lines human labor in these fields would long ago have ceased. It's true enough. Women overcome fastidiousness because that has been their job; men overcome inertia because that has been their job, and the reason for both achievements lies in the division of labor, not in essential differences. In fact, we show our essential similarity by each doing what is expected of us.

Moreover, we take our respective jobs seriously, so seriously that we are each accused by the other sex of having no sense of humor. And perhaps we haven't where those jobs are concerned. It's hard, terribly hard, to make Eve see sex as a joke, or as unimportant in the scheme of things, when it's her curse, and it's as hard to make Adam see business or war or any other form of hard work as a joke because work is his curse. Both are right, and both wrong. Curses are horrid things and very serious as long as you are subject to them; it is only when you have got free that they are funny.

But granting that the mental aspects of sex are the result of

training, can they now be changed? Naturally the first step is to convince ourselves that such a change is desirable; that these differences whose origin we can trace in superstition or misconception are actually a detriment and not a sign of progress.

15

BALANCE

CHINESE philosophy is credited with the theory that provides every human being with a male soul (*shen*) and a female soul (*kwei*) which by harmonious cooperation form an organic entity. Modern biologists point out traits derived from both masculine and feminine ancestors to explain this duality, and a modern hero of comedy appeals to the understanding of his beloved because "I am descended just as much from my grandmother as from my grandfather."

However we may explain it, most of us nowadays are willing to agree that the worth-while people of either sex are those who manifest qualities commonly attributed to the other camp, while retaining their own. Those who persist in preferring "manly men and womanly women" have usually retained a notion that a man can not put on any of the feminine virtues without putting off some of his own, and vice versa. Yet by common consent a gentleman is a man who exhibits the so-called feminine quality of gentleness, and a lady, according to Ruskin, is a "giver of bread," though providing bread was originally Adam's job. It is hard, on the whole, to deny that women who possess the "masculine" qualities of honesty and courage and force, while retaining "feminine" fineness, and men who attain "feminine" delicacy of touch without lacking the solidier qualities are the conspicuous exceptions who make up the world's rolls of real honor.

I realize that even intelligent men, having so long been considered lords of creation, may not be enthusiastic about this idea. The story goes that when a first novel sent out by a young writer who signed his name J. M. Barrie was returned with a letter beginning "Dear Madam" the publisher's compliment was unappreciated. Yet the genius who wrote *What Every Woman Knows*

had first to achieve a woman's point of view. Even Mr. Kipling, in his wonderful accuracy of aim, manifests a quality which he sees as characteristically feminine—the deadliness of the female of the species.

Obviously if such a combination of qualities is good, it follows that most of the work of the world is done badly because it is done by men or by women working singly or in groups of their own sex, handicapped by sexual prejudice and ignorance. This is not saying that we should do better by putting a man and a woman together at once on all jobs now done by men or by women. It is not overlooking the fact either that coeducational universities are notoriously less efficient than those closed to one sex. The latter condition has nothing to do with intellectual give-and-take, because the relationship between young men and young women in a university is rarely intellectual.

What I am trying to say is that a real combination of masculine and feminine points of view on a job, irrespective of how the combination is obtained—whether by discussion and argument, diplomatic influence, sharing of the work itself or by that fusion of masculine and feminine qualities in one intellect which we call genius—is irresistible in producing worth-while results. It is the plural spirit Elohim of creation, which we acknowledge in our use of the editorial or the regal “We.”

The genius obviously has the best of it in uniting in himself all the desirable traits. He has rough sledding in the world because the world, insisting on certain characteristics assumed to accompany his physical make-up, strenuously opposes his exercise of qualities supposed to belong to the other sex. Nevertheless, genius usually triumphs in the end because the combination of forces is capable of overcoming all the handicaps.

Those of us who do not consider ourselves geniuses seek to arrive at the combination by intellectual association. Usually we do this unconsciously, and so clumsily that the results are often negligible. Perhaps the rate at which material progress outstrips progress in *mores*—a rate which moves some people to de-

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

clare that material progress is the only kind we make—is accounted for by the theory that individuals working alone may produce mechanical inventions, while humane ideas require harmonious association for their conception. Once when men had the world of ideas all to themselves masculine association was sufficient; ever since women broke in things have been at a standstill because we haven't yet learned how to work together.

Intellectual give-and-take between men and women is not easy. Both are taught, not merely the different manners and morals mentioned before, but an almost prudish intellectual continence. Instructed for modesty's sake not to discuss certain matters in mixed company (at least the generation now adult was so instructed), they soon add to the tabooed list, for the sake of vanity or policy, all subjects in which there may be any possibility of friction. As some friction is necessary in order to get a good grip on anything, intellectual contact between the sexes dwindles into banalities, personalities and persiflage. At present real interchange of ideas is usually arrived at only as an accidental by-product of physical association. That is, people marry other people who appeal to them physically, and when both a man and his wife turn out to have sense an unexpected intellectual companionship results. This is what we call a "happy marriage."

Observing the success of these cases, we have evolved a theory of complements which is frequently held to be the best basis for marriage. This is the theory that two people may by combining their talents supplement each other's weaknesses, balancing their qualities so that together they are actually more than twice as effective as either would be alone. It is the ancient definition of marriage as resembling "a pair of shears, so joined that they can not be separated, often moving in opposite directions, yet punishing any one who comes between them."

Unfortunately, we haven't enough data to determine whether or not this two-by-two assortment is the plan of the universe. On the affirmative are all those who have found such perfect companionship or who believe that by eliminating certain present limita-

tions perfect companionship would be possible. On the negative are those who have not found it, and who believe that they must be for ever sufficient unto themselves.

At any rate the theory persists. Man seems to be of the opinion that he was not meant to live alone, and he seems also to be unable to live in perfect accord with many people at a time. He may have love affairs by the dozen and friends by the score, but he can not as a rule discover more than one companion for the things he thinks. He is lucky to have one, outside of books, and however companionable a book may be it can not answer back with a fresh idea. The conception of another person who shall need us as we need her or him, who will go with us through life as a left-hand glove goes with a right, occurs to many of us in childhood and stays with us in imagination even when not otherwise realized.

Unfortunately, this theory of balance as commonly understood seems to have the disadvantage of perpetuating sex differences. Numbers of people will agree that men and women are complementary—yes, certainly—but totally different; they will even argue that their complementary nature implies differences. Equality they may concede, the sort of equality that makes a pound of iron equal to a pound of feathers, but not likeness.

Yet the fact is that complementary working together demands not only equality but correspondence. Our eyes are true complements; for perfect vision they correspond. Our feet are complements, and they must be the same size if we are to wear comfortable shoes. In the same way complementary human characters must be equal and like; any difference must be in point of view, not in essential nature. Political intelligence runs an eastern candidate for president with a westerner for vice-president, but does not run a Republican with a Democrat. Or, to substitute temperamental for political differences, if one of two men is slow but sure while the other is quick but inaccurate they can work separately, or together when one is in authority; the slow but sure man can exercise sane executive control over the erratic

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

genius, or as an assistant he can do the drudgery while the genius makes brilliant plans. But if you harness them side by side to work on the same job the inevitable result is friction and damage.

In the interests of harmony we surely would not say that these two men must continue and increase their temperamental differences; we should not urge the slow but sure man to become slower and surer, and the quick but inaccurate man to become quicker and more inaccurate. Rather we urge the former to speed up and the latter to watch his step, with the view that both will become quick and sure.

And we do not, in this educative process, feel any fear that the world will become hopelessly standardized; we count on individual character to provide sufficient variety even after we have done all we can to make valuable qualities universal.

With men and women there is surely no more need to cling to differences when our best chance of harmonious cooperation demands that we have done with notions of feminine weakness opposed to masculine strength, feminine delicacy in contrast to masculine downrightness, and that we strive instead to extend the common ground of likeness.

The mistake of making the complement theory inseparable from sex differences, instead of wholly independent of them, becomes obvious when you apply it to other than human relationships. With our oversexed minds we speak of masculine and feminine attraction in electricity, masculine and feminine parts of a flower, masculine and feminine nouns and rhymes, attributing sex not only where there is actually physical interdependence of parts, as in flowers, but even when there are merely differences in construction, as in words. The floral arrangement may legitimately be termed sexual if we understand sex as altogether physical, its functions carried on by individuals who have no other attraction for each other. Obviously there can be no question of personal relationship or individual complement in such a view.

But take words as examples of sex in grammar; here you get into a mental realm as hard to chart as human life if you admit

that people have minds. A ship in English is feminine but has no complement; while the words near and far, which are complements, have no sex. Similarly in human relationships minds may be complementary without sex attraction, just as there may be sex attraction without the least mental correspondence.

As an intelligent man you have doubtless noticed that really satisfactory companionship is sexless. You may enjoy being with a beautiful girl because she is beautiful and a credit to you among men, but there, after all, you are thinking of yourself and your appearance. If you are really thinking of her it's likely that instead of her femininity being uppermost in your mind you are enjoying her amusing ideas or her good sense or her charm as an individual.

Not only is this true of friendship; the very union which is the lover's aim can be reached only through the dissolution of differences. Since it is plain that unlike minds can not hope to reach complete accord, it must be that, as a writer of modern fiction has observed, "the higher moments of passion are sexless." You may be intoxicated by the physical nearness of your temperamental opposite, your curiosity may be excited, but in the very interest of strangeness there is detachment. There can be no interchange without a medium; you can add whole integers as they are, but you can only add vulgar fractions by finding a common denominator. Some day we may come to feel that marriage between totally unlike natures is in fact a kind of miscegenation, seeing in the financier's legal infatuation for a chorus girl (assuming his failure to credit her with financial genius equal to his own) a similarity to the white trader's occupation with a South Seas beauty.

In a recent compendium of views on modern marriage one writer announces that "The approach of the sexes, due to their perception of a super-sexual type, is already a fact. This has nothing to do with the ancient idea of the hermaphrodite—or, according to Freud, with that of a bisexual being—but with the homogenous comprehension of the complete man." One of his

colleagues adds that "In reality the change consists in both sexes becoming more fully 'human,' and this facilitates companionship."*

16

COOPERATION

SO far I have asked you to believe:

That sex is a physical not a mental distinction.

That mental differences apparently due to sex are the result of artificially imposed standards.

That creation of these differences is not desirable, inasmuch as the most efficient people unite in themselves both masculine and feminine qualities, or gain such qualities by association, and even the gain through association is impossible if sexual differences are emphasized.

If these assumptions are true it follows that through our whole lives, even including marriage, we must strive to minimize sexual differences.

Conditions of life as we know it invite us to do just the opposite. Psychologists point out that the custom of calling attention to bodily structure by dress and decoration is inconsistent with the proclaimed modesty of our moral code. We shriek sex by clothes and manners, otherwise denying its propriety. Moralists who are most anxious to preserve purity are also first to insist upon the sacred taboos; they argue for the preservation of secondary sexual characteristics while striving to control the primal urge. If we listen to tradition we must cling even to our sexual weaknesses as faithfully as the Australian tribesmen guarded the bats which were the emblems of masculinity, while their women cherished the sacred owls.†

*The first quotation is from Alphonse Maeder, on "Marriage and Self-Development," and the second from Thomas Mann on "Marriage in Transition," both from *The Book of Marriage*.

†"The jealous protection thus afforded by Australian men and women to bats and owls respectively . . . is not based upon purely selfish considerations.

COOPERATION

Nor, of course, is sex emphasis the monopoly of moralists. Most poets still sing as frankly as Henley of the "love which is lust"; dramatists (except my grandfather) depend upon it for second-act thrills; composers set it to wailing and throbbing music, and fine craftsmen work in silks and metals to help us visualize it. We can't escape it—can't escape it—needn't try to escape it—is dinned into us, pictured before our eyes, forced upon us through every avenue of sense.

These things have their effect. And assuming for the moment that you came with me so far, I can imagine your saying now, "Very well, but where do we go from here? Admitted that physical differences are unimportant, that mental relationships are more important; here, nevertheless, are our physical beings, our normal desires, with us day and night and worth a ton of paper philosophy in determining what we do. Does the conclusion that physical existence is unimportant give me license to do anything I please? Does not that freedom conflict with mental achievement? Even if I see a danger how, under the present system, am I to avoid it?"

These questions bring us to another division of the subject. Let us say that we have concluded, for the present, our survey of the conditions and materials of your experiment. We have looked at the changes affecting women, and at the varieties of love, and we have considered sex differences as a handicap affecting both women and love. The next step is to weigh the advice freely offered you by the civilized world through its accredited agencies.

For each man believes that not only his own life but the lives of his father, brothers, sons and so on are bound up with the lives of particular bats, and that therefore in protecting the bat species he is protecting the lives of all his male relations as well as his own. Similarly, each woman believes that the lives of her mother, sisters, daughters, and so forth, equally with her own, are bound up with the lives of particular owls, and that in guarding the owl species she is guarding the lives of all her female relations. . . ." Frazer, *The Golden Bough*.

IT'S hard not to feel some shyness in approaching a discussion of sex and religion. The ground has been trod into a morass by those who expect to find an occult connection between the two. In a sense of course they are right; as there is undoubtedly a connection between man and God, so there is a connection between man's ideas about himself, of which sex seems at present to be the most noticeable, and his ideas about God.

As in a preceding section I mentioned that the best men and women were above sex limitations, so I am now prepared to maintain that the best idea of God is above them.

God as many of us are taught to know Him was made subject to sex as far back as the second chapter of Genesis, in which the word Jehovah is first used. In the first chapter the word for God is Elohim, which is plural and of no sex. Jehovah however is masculine and singular, and it is the Jehovist idea which gained most ground in the popular mind. Jehovah is the god that the anthropologists are able to connect with the Old Man of the Tribe; Jehovah is the big turtle or the great bear or the omnipotent falcon, depending on whether the tribal affiliation happens to be reptilian, ursine or ornithological. Jehovah is the God made in man's own image, and man in this case does not include both genders.

Only occasionally has there been any objection to this tribal god in what we call the Christian world. Once in the days of suffrage agitation a suffragist suggested to a bishop that as there was no sex in Spirit, the next incarnation of divinity might be in female form. It shocked the bishop quite as much as she hoped. On the whole the masculinity of Deity has been admitted without question.

But most of us when we are small take our worries to mother, and we are apt to grow up feeling, in time of trouble, a need for something less virile and more comforting than Jehovah of the thunders. The hope of the intercession of the Blessed Virgin

in human affairs has been called a logical if unconscious attempt to reestablish the feminine qualities lacking in Jehovah. But we should not need feminine intercession if we had held to the first concept of God as Elohim, We. As the creator of man, both male and female, this We must have included both male and female qualities.

Such duality need not bother us if, as modern deists are coming to do, we think of God not as a person or persons but as a Principle operative in human affairs. Law may include and comprehend both sexes, as indeed we are amending our own laws to do.

The essential point for us at present is that somewhere in that Law, reported to extend its dominion over the sparrow sold for a farthing, must be some helpful applicability to a question as perplexing as that of marriage.

LET us merely for the sake of clarity start with the first chapter of Genesis.

In that chapter God, called Elohim, decrees the existence of the universe and man to be made "in our image, after our likeness . . . male and female," and given dominion over all the earth.

In the second chapter a very different tale is told. After God—Elohim—ended His work and pronounced it good, Jehovah came along and did the job completely over.

In this second account Jehovah makes man of the dust of the ground, subsidiary to the soil. Elohim's man was given dominion, but Jehovah's idea is wholly utilitarian—there was nobody to till the ground. Here, instead of the genesis of the sons of God, we have the genesis of the Farm Bloc.

There is also a difference in the actual construction. Elohim clearly had infinite power; he spake and it was done. But

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Jehovah must go through a clumsy but minutely described process of manufacture; he makes man from dust, mud-pie fashion, and he isn't even finished then. Later Jehovah notices his incompleteness, since he has not been made "male and female" in "our" likeness, and so the animals are made and introduced to provide companionship. When they fail to satisfy the demand Jehovah puts Adam to sleep and produces Eve.

The two stories, as you see, are so opposed that if one represents the true creation the other must be false. Before deciding which is which let us compare the main points of difference:

Elohistic Version

Man, male and female, is made in the image of God.

Man is given dominion over all the earth.

Man is given every tree for food.

Man is blessed.

• Jehovistic Version

Adam is made from the dust of the ground, Eve from Adam's rib.

Adam is put into the Garden to dress and keep it.

Man is given every tree save one.

Adam and Eve and their descendants are cursed.

The second, which might be called the sexual version of creation, is obviously more familiar to us and has eclipsed the first version almost entirely in popular thought. Fundamental believers feel it a duty to believe in Adam and Eve, overlooking the pre-Adamic creation completely.

Adam's universal popularity, not only with novelists (Mr. Erskine, Mr. Cabell) but with anthropologists who find him in tribal legends from Mexico to Europe, is no doubt due to the fact that he seems closer to human nature as we see it than any man made in God's image could be. And if we are to persist in identifying ourselves with him let us consider his recorded end to discover, if possible, the guidance we are seeking.

The first Creator, Elohim, had pronounced all that He made good. But Jehovah planted the tree of good and evil knowledge,

and then said, "Mustn't touch," quite in the usual manner of an Old Man of the Tribe. The penalty for investigation was death. Adam and Eve, however, were not without ambition to better their state, and the Snake suggested that to those who became "as gods" death mightn't be so certain. So Eve ate, and Adam ate, and both were caught and punished. Adam's curse was to till the soil, Eve's to have children and be ruled by her husband. Both were driven out of paradise, where cherubim and flaming sword henceforth guarded the way to the tree of life, and Adam and Eve eventually died.

The first thing that strikes the lay observer about this story is that the guilt is not Adam's or Eve's so much as Jehovah's. Jehovah presumably made the serpent as he planted the tree. There seems an unfairness about the whole procedure. Man was doomed to fall from the first; he was made wrong or he couldn't have done wrong. Placing the tree in the Garden and then making a threat of danger regarding it was a challenge which even a man of dust could hardly refuse. We have now learned to erect memorial tablets, at least, to men who go in for those exploits wherein it is said that they shall surely die. To any person of the smallest spirit of adventure the life of the Garden must have seemed so tame that it would have been worth dying to get out of there.

Presumably if the apple had stayed on the tree Adam and Eve would have continued indefinitely their peaceful vegetation *à deux*, leaving the rest of the world non-existent. The Fall, therefore, must have been a necessary phase of creation. Jehovah evidently expected this very thing to happen and used it as an excuse for imposing upon the Adam family the task of populating the universe.

It was perhaps through belief that this was actually the divine plan that the consequence of wrong-doing—the "curse" resulting from the desire to be "as gods"—should have been considered by theologians as divine authority for the thing cursed. The fact is that "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children" and "in the

sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" were not commandments but results of breaking a commandment. To make a transgression the occasion for initiating a creative system seems to make God too much of an opportunist—an objection, by the way, which attaches to the view that he later made the crucifixion of his Son the occasion for saving the world.

I hope you do not think me too critical of Jehovah. The truth is that the whole second chapter story seems to me valuable only for its exposure of the counterfeit man, whom Saint Paul called the "carnal man," and his explanation of creation by an imperfect deity. If his sin is falling for the theory that evil is as much a necessity as good—and this is apparently the significance of the forbidden tree—then I can see no better example of the mistake than acceptance of Jehovah as the real creator, or confusion of him with the Elohim of the first chapter.

If we are to avoid that conclusion we must refuse to make the Adam legend the basis of our own morality, and indeed we need not have considered it at all except as the source of commonly accepted difficulties.

For though it may not appeal to us nowadays we must remember that the Jehovistic theory is the one that gained ground. The whole Jewish tribal state was built on this conception of creation, and we find throughout the Old Testament no substantial deviation from the views therein laid down.

Women under Levitical law were, that is, valuable only as Eve was valuable after the expulsion from the Garden—not as equal companions but as bearers of sons. Their status otherwise is revealed in the stories of the two Old Testament heroines, Ruth and Esther.

In the first of these you find that Ruth, a young and penniless widow, with Naomi, her mother-in-law, came to Bethlehem in the middle of barley harvest. There she "found grace" in the eyes of a "mighty man of wealth" named Boaz. Later, at Naomi's suggestion, when "Boaz had eaten and drunk and his heart was merry . . . she came softly and"—let us say per-

suaded him, with the aid of tact and the cosmetics of the period, to propose marriage. At any rate Boaz did marry her in the end; that is, he bought her by the simple process of taking off his shoe in the presence of witnesses. And the whole moral of the story seems to be that of our own Lorelei, namely that a mighty man of wealth (modern translation, heavy sugar daddy) may, if properly approached by a girl, be induced to contribute food and gifts and even to go through with a legal ceremony.

Esther's objects and position were different but her methods were similar. She was, if you remember, a second wife, and her predecessor, Vashti, had been "put away" for refusing to accede to the whims of the king at the end of a seven-day drinking-bout. On that occasion the king's counselors advised divorce on the ground that in resisting his commands Vashti had endangered the domestic authority of the princes and of all other husbands throughout the province.

Esther, warned by this example, managed better. To obtain preferment for herself and safety for her people, she employed the approved feminine approaches of royal apparel and a two-day banquet, and they succeeded. Nevertheless, her lord's offer of half the kingdom must be taken with a grain of salt, for he had already caused it to be written among the laws of the Medes and the Persians that "every man should bear rule in his own house."

Please do not consider that I am putting an unflattering construction on these two stories out of any animosity toward Ruth and Esther. Considered by the standards of their time, they did very well indeed. Being a woman was a woman's only means of support, and both made use of their one talent to the best advantage—Esther for her people, Ruth for Naomi's sake as well as for her own. The point I am trying to make is that in neither story is there the least idea of equality or companionship or anything else but sex appeal in marriage. The curse of Eve had come true.

INTO a world, then, which had accepted the Jehovistic story with all its implications came Christianity urging a return to the theories of the first chapter.

Our concern is only with the Christian revolution in so far as it affected marriage, and at first glance the Christian teachings about marriage seem not only few and far between, but difficult to understand. But it must be remembered that marital reform, important as it seems nowadays, was not the primary object of Christianity. Christianity took on the general job of reforming the world.

Naturally in doing this marriage was touched on. The whole effort of Christian teaching to assure the world of God's goodness and the possible dominion of man made in His likeness seems directed against Jehovah. The "new man" of the New Testament, as different from Adam as possible, is obviously the man Elohim created. As Saint Paul put it, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And this changed point of view meant a lifting of the old curses. The Christian miracles multiplied bread and took money from fishes' mouths, thus invalidating Adam's curse of labor; they raised the dead, relieving the daughters of Eve from their task of replacing lost lives.

This is no place to discuss the validity of miracles, and I am not asking you to believe them, but to consider their significance as showing the direction of Christian teaching. For the first of them all was at the marriage at Cana, where Christ turned the water into wine.

It will, I think, be well to remember this simple, friendly little miracle when we look at the teachings about marriage which have been interpreted to mean so much more, and so much less, than the life and freedom that the miracles offered.

It is odd that the Christian speech upon which the marriage service has been founded should have been made in answer to a question of the Pharisees concerning divorce. Jesus said:

"Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female,

"And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?"

"Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

This speech like any other speech requires interpretation in the light of the circumstances in which it was made. If marriage as we know it to-day was unknown, divorce exactly as we have it was well known—for men. A man could "put away" his wife without more cause than having seen a more attractive lady, so that marriage became a convenience for self-indulgence. The reference to the equal male-and-female creation of the first chapter seems to indicate that a type of marriage better calculated to be permanent must be based on equality.

But those who read into the passage a prohibition of divorce must go aground on the invitation to forsake all relationships—"houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children"—that may block the way to heaven. In the sentence "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder," the pronoun is *what*, not *whom*. Divine wisdom may join masculine and feminine qualities to form the complete man, and realizing a lack in himself a man may "for this cause . . . forsake father and mother and cleave unto his wife." But approval of this arrangement for human progress can hardly be fairly invoked as perpetuation of all those misalliances solemnized in the name of heaven yet producing an excellent imitation of hell upon earth.

When being warned against casual divorce his disciples not unnaturally concluded that marriage might well be avoided. Jesus spoke further:

"All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

"For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made

eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

This is clear enough if you take it as a continuation of the discussion. The disciples had suggested that it was as well not to marry, but they had not said "for a man to avoid desire to marry." The answer, translated to mental terms, referred not only to celibacy but celibacy without desire as the only effective variety. On another occasion chastity was even more plainly defined: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."* The intention here is clearly not to emphasize the menace of woman—though the verse has been so interpreted—but the mental nature of sin. Similarly the verse about the eunuchs suggests as a sound basis for celibacy complete freedom from sex consciousness rather than avoidance of sex as a temptation; it was unnecessary for the eunuch to withdraw from the world. He came and went as he pleased, often had leisure and wealth and learning and power—everything except the honor accorded even the lowest Hebrew father of a son.

On this one point of the importance of parenthood occurs a striking deviation from Jehovistic theory. Nowhere in Christian teaching is there any basis for the anxiety about race suicide so noticeable in the ordinances of the Old Testament. Christianity concerned itself with a man who was, according to the writer of Hebrews, "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God." On one occasion Jesus remarked that the power of God was sufficient to raise up witnesses from the stones of a Jerusalem street. It seems fairly evident that he considered man, as a spiritual being endowed by God with immortality, quite free from any obligation to perpetuate himself physically.

*Compare Hindoo scripture: "He who, restraining the organs of action and sensation, remains dwelling upon objects of sense is deluded in heart, and is called a hypocrite." *Bhagavad Gîtâ*.

Which brings us logically to the third and last long speech about marriage, and one which is hardest to understand unless it is remembered that it was made in connection with this point about parenthood. To the Sadducees who presented the famous case of the seven brothers who married the same woman in order to "raise up seed," Jesus replied:

"The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage:

"But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage:

"Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

This is a condemnation of marriage in terms which are to the Christian sufficiently plain, since the Christian's object is to attain heaven. But it is a condemnation of marriage as a legal arrangement for procreation, this being the only possible reason for the arrangement described, and such an arrangement could hardly be favored by one who said "call no man your father upon the earth."

The sacredness of home as well as family was threatened when Jesus remarked apparently without self-pity that the Son of man had not a place to lay his head. He invited students to follow him in disregard of other possible duties, and his regard for his own family was exactly equal to his regard for humanity in general; he specified as much on the occasion of their visit to him.

Not only did he show little reverence for the whole system of human heredity, he advised one inquirer that he must be "born again," not of the flesh but of the spirit, since the flesh profited nothing.

But Christian teaching as to the fruitlessness of human generation did not extend to contempt for children as individuals. When after the most downright disparagement of marriage for generation the disciples sought zealously to protect their master

from children brought for his touch he rebuked them with the explanation that the kingdom of heaven was found in the child mind. And indeed it is obvious that if disparagement of procreation is a blow to the powers of the adult it raises the status of the child by giving him a more important father.

Thus the three passages I have quoted, while at first glance difficult and even forbidding, may be interpreted in terms of liberty, equality and fraternity; men and women are to be freed from bondage to each other or to sexual desire, and children are spared inheritance of human limitation. But beyond this general lifting of the Jehovistic curse you will find no detailed recommendations as to marriage. It is neither commanded nor forbidden.

At the beginning I said that marriage problems were not the chief concern of Christianity, and my grandfather has pointed out that it is well to agitate for low-heeled shoes in an especially smart hat; in other words, to conform as nearly as possible to the customs of the time in all lesser matters when presenting one revolutionary truth. But this caution is not the reason why there are no more definite Christian prescriptions on this point.

The fact is that as religious teachings must be universally applicable it is manifestly impossible to say, from a religious standpoint, you *shall* marry. That would be to set every disciple looking about for a wife, and the result would be satisfactory only if any wife would do. That is obviously untrue, and so recognized by the reply to the Sadducees which indicated that a dead man's wife would not do for his brother. Not even fifty out of a hundred possible wives would do for you; hardly ten out of a hundred. Perhaps, if the romanticists are right, only one out of the universe. And if this is the proportion it is impractical to enjoin marriage; your search for the one woman would force you to neglect too many other duties. Swedenborg, who made the most of a religious case for marriage, went aground on the question of choice and postponed his perfect examples to the next life with wives allotted by heaven.

WATER INTO WINE

Equally, of course, it is impossible for Christianity or any other idealistic religion to say you shall not marry, and such a prohibition is mentioned among the signs of "antichrist." Idealism can not issue prohibitions; it can only make suggestions. The moment the idealist forbids anything he presents his followers with another motive than the reason he wishes them to consider.

In other words, since the whole effort of idealistic teaching is to do away with any belief in material necessity, the idealist ruins his case if he emphasizes physical behavior. As a very intelligent man once expressed it, asceticism and sensuality are two ends of the same stick. To the materialist undue importance attaches to material acts whether they are commendable or the reverse; pagans may worship virginity as a material state, and be quite as material in their view-point as if they were worshipping fertility. In fact, the two forms of worship generally went together. But the idealist can not argue that any physical condition is important except as the outward and visible reflection of a state of mind.

Instead of the physical quality of virginity the Christian recommendation stresses the mental quality of innocence. And the theory of salvation further implies that innocence, far from being something you have and lose irrevocably, is something which can be regained through effort; a pessimistic prophet merely asked how long before we should attain it. The process was further described by Saint Paul when he said that "this corruptible must put on incorruption." Corruptibility is the obvious opposite of innocence, integrity, wholeness or, as the Bible has it, holiness, being the quality of being affected—weakened, permeated, rotted—by surrounding influences. That is why, apparently, incorruptibility is not to be put on in heaven but on earth before heaven can be entered. Integrity can not be demonstrated in completely hygienic surroundings; it may flourish there, but it can only be tested by association with corrupting influences. Bite the shilling, try to scratch the diamond, and leave the can-

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

didate for heavenly holiness upon earth to combat "the delusion of opposites."

So the Son of man came eating and drinking. The wine of Cana, I was once assured by a Sunday-school teacher, was non-intoxicating. Adult intelligence rejects this ingenious notion but suggests that the Christian will not become intoxicated, if for no other reason than that intelligent enjoyment is impossible to those who go in for befuddlement. It is dissatisfaction with life which impels us to shorten it in sleep or drunken coma, and such inappreciation of God's world must appear blasphemous to the Christian. He must stay awake to employ undimmed faculties in discovering the good things provided for him, even though, as at Cana, the good wine is not served until the end.

And though we may find no definite requirements we may, I think, by considering the whole Christian teaching, find very definite suggestions about marriage and celibacy. Tabulation of them might evolve something like this:

Equality of men and women—the actual unimportance of sex.

The unreality—i. e., the fleeting and delusory nature, impermanence—of physical or sex attraction.

The unimportance of physical appearance save as an index of spiritual or mental qualities which alter appearance.

The wrong of deliberate exercise of sex attraction for any motive.

The mental nature of sin, whereby adultery in thought may be productive of as much harm as adultery in action.

The possibility of contented continency, before or after marriage, through the exercise of self-control based on revaluation of the universe on a mental rather than a material scale.

The unimportance of birth among immortals.

The essential unreality of death.

The unimportance of heredity among God's children.

The importance of human obligation to bring up all children properly as a part of the Christian relationship to all mankind.

The necessity for progress as a law of God.

The importance of thinking no ill of one's neighbor who may be at another stage of progress.

BENEFIT OF CLERGY

Understand, I am making no effort to persuade you to accept these conclusions; I merely list them as my own impression of the trend of Christian teachings considered at their New Testament source. I am quite well aware that they are not what are called orthodox conclusions, and now that we have looked briefly at the original teachings it may be interesting to try to discover how Hebrew marriage, affected by the Christian ideal, gave us Puritan marriage, Victorian marriage and the Hollywood variety. The answer must be sought in the history of organized religion.

20

BENEFIT OF CLERGY

ORDINARILY we credit the orthodox Christian churches with the institution of romantic monogamy as it exists to-day. This is not quite fair, for the present institution is not wholly the fault of the church, being somewhat the result of feudal chivalry, and clearly connected with economic pressure operating to reduce the number of wives.

The Christian teachings which I have quoted were not at first ignored. Gathering from them and from Christ's example that the institution of marriage as known on earth was not highly considered in heaven, many of the saints embraced celibacy and enjoined it upon those who followed them into monastic foundations.

But the material welfare of the church, like the material welfare of any other state, demanded some provision for successive generations and increased numerical strength. Man-power was needed for the Crusades. And so, with a brave readiness to act for heaven, the church gave its blessing to marriage.

The difficulty was here: because it did not understand the teachings of its Founder, or see any possibility of applying them, the church gave to marriage toleration and even approval, but no real regeneration. Pouring its new gospel into the old bottles of pagan and Jewish custom, the Christian state accepted the cur-

rent view of the sexes which made man superior. Christian teaching of the value of spirit instead of matter might remove man's physical basis for superiority; Saint Paul might say that "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus"—but the church fathers put *obey* into the marriage ceremony.

Christ had cured disease and taught his followers to do the same, but they provided for all eventualities in the marriage ceremony with a promise of fidelity "in sickness as in health."

Christ had promised eternal life, but they put into the marriage ceremony the qualification "till death do us part."

And so it would be possible to go on multiplying instances in which religious teaching as we have it fails to agree with Christian teaching, just as current Buddhist or Confucian practise fails to square with the theology of Guatama or the first Superior Man. Those who grow discouraged at apparent Christian failure to conquer the world on this or any other point may take courage from Mr. Chesterton's assurance: "The Christian ideal has not been tried and found wanting. It has been found difficult; and left untried."

Unfortunately it seems to the detached observer that church organizations as they exist to-day are operating for the most part on a basis long outgrown even by governments—the importance of the organization rather than the individual. Of course there are degrees of liberty in churches exactly as there are degrees of liberty in states, but the basic idea that the individual can be saved, guarded or protected by a power outside his own understanding seems dangerously common to all of them.

To the mind honestly in search of happiness Christian teaching seems most valuable in its destruction of ancient and evil tradition. Like any other successful ambassador Christ was notable for his intelligent understanding of the people to whom he was sent, so that even now he appears as a minister to ministers,

as a physician to physicians, and as a super-business man to one of that description. But most clearly of all he appears to the revolutionary as a revolutionary. This is of course in keeping with the prophetic description of him as "the Lord *our* righteousness."

Of him the same prophet said that he should choose the good and refuse the evil, and to the individualistic Christian view this same job confronts any man determined to escape the curse incident to Adam's confusion of the two. In short, judgment day in the individual mind is the prelude to any return to Paradise; passive acceptance of wrong conditions as divinely imposed may become a blasphemous insult to the Creator.

At least, with all its faults, passive acceptance of wrong is no characteristic of the modern mind. This mind, then, to-day is rebelling—consciously or unconsciously—against the theory that God creates man through man, setting his blessing upon the sexual arrangement as we understand it. Whatever our sins, we are ceasing to worship simultaneously at the altars of Baal and Elohim, Aphrodite and Christ. The theory that sex was invariably good, God-given and God-blessed might be tenable when people could imagine that God superintended personally every lovers' meeting; observation has burst the bubble and convinced us that He can hardly preside at many meetings productive of progeny.

To any mind freed from dogma the whole idea seems to credit the divine mind with criminal carelessness and little or no ingenuity. And is it no part of the duty owed a jealous God to endow Him with at least as much intelligence and good-will as we ourselves exhibit? Would we, possessed of all our faculties, choose to turn loose a blind force like sex attraction, cause lust and rape and prostitution in order that the world might continue? Would we willingly create, after the first creation, through processes as clumsy as a bad dream, and follow the pains of birth with burial in decay? A kinder Providence would have let the earth perish cleanly in that flood which came, as the story goes,

when the Sons of God were first corrupted by the fair but frail daughters of men.

And in the midst of anguished announcements that we are headed straight for damnation I submit that in rejecting sacred traditions regarding sex and searching for a workable solution to the evils of mistaken choice, unwanted children and polygamous instinct we are actually nearer the realization of Christian intent than ever before.

The meanest trick played by the Puritans was in alienating, through misapplication of certain truths, the liberal and liberty-loving mind from the truths themselves. Because the Puritan mind in every age tries to enforce by statute ideas which should be suggested and enthusiastically adopted as a means to greater happiness, ordinary human nature rebels and rejects the whole philosophy. The Puritan would forbid dolls because dolls are stuffed with sawdust; the normal mind prefers to cherish its toys until it can exchange them for something demonstrably more interesting.

The ordinances of religion, the law and the prophets, might be more generally welcomed if they were seen as guides to make easier our way and to accelerate our progress toward a more desirable state. They would, no doubt, still be compelled to point out that the way to achieve happiness is to begin with self-denial, forsaking things which we have believed indispensable. But it shows poor advertising sense to announce the self-denial and soft-pedal the fun.

Suppose the wonder-working exerciser that is to make fat folks thin showed, instead of the picture of the fat man reduced to sylphlike proportions, a picture of him bending wearily to the exercise. Suppose instead of a head-line "Be Beautiful! Claim Your Heritage of Grace!" the advertisement advised "Bend to Your Task! The Blank Exerciser Company Needs You!" And suppose that instead of promising freedom from obesity in thirty days, if you followed directions faithfully,—or your money back,—the only promise was that you'd be thin when you died.

BENEFIT OF CLERGY

Since we speak of the consolations instead of the accomplishments of religion, since the church stands more often as a pauper pleading for alms than as a benefactor distributing the abundant largesse of heaven, is its survival a testimony to the piety or the inertia of the human race?

It is hard not to feel that ecclesiasticism recruits its most loyal adherents among those who, far from objecting to any interference with their right to think as they please, welcome release from responsibility. Organized Christianity as we have it to-day seems to make little claim to solve practical problems, though it volunteers to deliver you from the necessity of troubling your mind about the universe.

Oddly enough the Founder of Christianity adopted a policy just the reverse. He did not absolve his followers from thought; he urged it upon them, even recommending it in the night watches, and yet, while they were devoting themselves to the search for the kingdom of heaven, he took care that the things which the Father knew they had need of were added unto them.

He made the remarkable statements about marriage which I have quoted, but first he did a miracle for a wedding present.

It seems reasonable to expect that a church or an idea which is to take his place to-day should be no less able to accomplish this first gift, the turning of water into wine. If it isn't done—if we have instead only a doubtful and sometimes poisonous home brew—is the trouble with the water, with the wedding guests, or with ecclesiastical interpretation and application of the Law?

That organized Christianity makes little effective effort to solve the practical problems of humanity, especially the problem of marriage, may be disputed. I concede at once that the Monday newspapers are filled with pronouncements on marriage which are intended to be practical. Moreover, there have been intelligent discussions of marital problems, chiefly divorce and birth control, written by prominent clergymen who realized that such problems were only phases of the basic question of spiritual

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

values in marriage. Two of them reached this conclusion in magazine articles appearing simultaneously. "It is marriage, not divorce, which worries me,"* one admitted; the other said, "The only solution of the problem, if there is such a thing, is at the marriage end."†

But you notice at once that both express concern and uncertainty, or at least extreme modesty, in proposing a solution; an attitude which falls visibly short of the Christianity which once "spoke as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

This chastened attitude, I hasten to add, is surely preferable to confident preaching of worn-out theories. And if you doubt this I shall quote these little sayings of a none-too-obscure divine:

"Make the honeymoon perpetual by feeding love.

"Be to each other's faults blind and to each other's virtues kind.

"Learn to double each other's joys and halve each other's sorrows.

"Economize and buy your own home.

"Seek the blessing of childhood.

"Have your lives insured.

"Keep two bears in the home: bear and forbear.

"Budget your income and give a definite proportion to good causes.

"Make the Master the head of your house, the Unseen Guest of every meal.

"Unite with some church."

Surely any considered comment would be unkind. I am only moved to quote my grandfather's report of the compassionate blessing of Monseigneur Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais: "*Sancta simplicitas!*"

But between this and the more intelligent admissions of inadequacy we have no wine.

To-day's miracles, they say, are those of science. Let us

*John Haynes Holmes, "Marriage and Divorce," *Forum*, October, 1928.

†Harry Emerson Fosdick, "What is Happening to the American Family?" *American Magazine*, October, 1928.

THE DOGMAS OF SCIENCE

now see with what authority the scientific Messiahs speak, and whether the Bunsen burner sheds a clearer glow than the altar candle.

21

THE DOGMAS OF SCIENCE

WHEN we come to talk about science we are even more at sea than we were with religion, for there are on the whole more scientific than religious sects. A scientific sect needs only one member.

Science to-day is in the place occupied by religion in the Middle Ages; secure in its hold on popular faith, it amuses itself by bizarre speculation, and learned doctors number the germs on a pinhead with an enthusiasm equal to that of medieval schoolmen in determining how many angels might dance in the same space. Meanwhile the lay mind accustomed to speak glibly of "science" as a whole discovers, after the most superficial investigation, that chasms separate such romantic explorers as J. B. S. Haldane from the schoolbook pluggers, and that John B. Watson and Sigmund Freud have rather less in common than the Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton and His Holiness at Rome.

In short, the faith founded on Darwin's rock is already suffering doctrinal cleavages. To avoid them let us, as in the case of religion, go back; not so far back this time, merely to those beginnings in the reign of Queen Victoria which suggest to the modern mind that the initials of our era might as well be translated After Darwin.

22

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION

YOU as an intelligent man no doubt believe in evolution even though you may be a native of Tennessee or Texas. I trust this belief has given you as it should a proper sense of freedom in the material world, and a comfortable contempt for what some people still call the laws of nature.

As the great significance of Christianity was revolt against

Jehovistic theology, so the great significance of Darwin's discovery seems to be its implications that the commonly accepted tyranny of nature was not as absolute as had been supposed. As intelligent evolutionists we can not trust too blindly to natural laws which history tells us may be amended or annulled. We may regard current regulations with interest, but we can not afford to assign to them any more permanence than history assigns to four-footed locomotion or the process of breathing through gills.

So when people begin to talk confidently about laws of nature the believer in evolution must say at once, "What laws of nature?" for natural science itself reveals that the world's progress from primordial ooze to life as he knows it has been through the successive abandonment of beliefs once cherished as laws, the successful achievement of natural impossibilities. As the westward march of empire left in its path the bleached bones of the pioneers, so the road to civilization is marked by the remnants of outgrown beliefs which once were laws.

The obvious advantage of the evolutionary theory, and one which should have caused every constructive religionist to hail it with joy, is that it brings infinite possibilities for improvement. If we have changed, we can change again. We can alter the seemingly irrevocable ordinances which govern us—not all at once, it is true, but here a little and there a little, by habit if not by fiat. And this very idea of conscious evolution offers to religion possibilities of power lost with paradise.

Unfortunately, lazy theologians, accustomed to existing conditions, found it easier to combat the new theory than to reap the advantage of preaching conscious evolution. So we have a fence between the fundamental principles of modern science and the fundamentals of orthodox religion. Huxley might say invitingly: "By science I understand all knowledge which rests upon evidence and reasoning of a like character to that which claims our assent to ordinary scientific propositions; and if any one is able to make good his assertion that his theology rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning, then it appears to me that

such theology must take its place as a part of science." But orthodox religion disregarded the invitation, and deprived of any coherent moral relation to life, natural science was left to do what it pleased with its discovery.

It promptly pleased to do what religion had already done; it dammed the stream of truth for no general profit but leased its power, so to speak, to individuals and organizations intent on profitable monopoly. So now we have natural science attempting to regulate our lives by laws based on a partial application of its great truth of evolution as in earlier times religion attempted to govern us by partial application of the truth of Christianity.

Such partial application of truth always overlooks possibilities of progress in its emphasis upon the need for submission to authority. The early church did not say: "Here is the truth of Christianity, which proves by the life of a man who was the Son of God that all men are actually intended to be sons of God and conquer the world." The church said instead: "The Son of God, who came to earth to save mankind, appointed us his successor. Come to us and be saved."

So the science of the schools did not say: "We have discovered by geological research that the earth and man upon it were not always as they are to-day. There have been marvelous changes, improvements in physical life which adapts itself to changing conditions. While these changes have so far been unconscious, there is nothing in our research to indicate that they might not be deliberate, leading to unlimited further improvement." True, something very much like that had been said by Darwin when he concluded optimistically that "As natural selection works solely by and for the good of each being, all corporeal and mental endowments will tend to progress towards perfection."* But following the example of institutional religion in narrowing the original range of discovery, institutional science soon learned to say: "We have made remarkable changes which prove that men to-day are the result of changes and adjustments in their racial

**The Origin of Species.*

past. As this racial past affects your present you must come to us and learn how to live in conformity with it."

The first proposition, you see, offers an interesting opportunity to alter conditions, a wide field for achievement. But the second proposition jells the present and the future in the mold of the past and narrows opportunity to the scientific specialist who, like the specialist in household decoration, is usually more concerned with period reproductions than with original designs.

As yet we have had no serious quarrel with the limitations imposed by science because, being comparatively new, they are not so irksome as those of religion were. The self-expressionist who has thrown overboard the moral code of the church has not had time to discover in the "new decalogue of science" all the punishments, since they are other than the familiar ones of fire and brimstone. More, scientific laws are still attractively vague and therefore easily evaded by the hopeful hedonist.

But he is trying harder now to understand his new religion, which, as we have observed before, is encouraging his faith with miracles, and which is also giving flattering if belated attention to his mental development. Let us now dip for a moment, since everybody is doing just that, into psychology.

23

FREUDIAN LIMITATIONS

NOWHERE is the backward-looking tendency of science better illustrated than in the case of that school of psychology which, making self-expression its sacred goal, handicaps its believers with the theory of inescapable hereditary traits. The idea that one is born subject to rigid ancestral limitations, as set forth in all its beauty by a conscientious biologist or a good Freudian, should have a familiar ring if you by any chance attended an old-fashioned Sunday-school. Somewhat more clearly put, perhaps, it was there promulgated as the doctrine of Original Sin.

Indeed there is a closer parallel than is generally realized be-

tween the teachings of the Freudian or sexual school of psychology and those of the Jehovistic or sexual theory of religion. If the old idea of God's using Adam's sin to keep the world going allowed us little freedom, the newer plan of subjection to complexes allows us still less. Could greater tyranny be imagined than that of a philosophy which says in effect: "The important part of you is a part about which you know nothing, a part that only sleeps when you [what you?] are conscious. This beast within you must be satisfied, and though it demands what your reason would deny, if you do not fulfil its desires it will make you miserable, useless, thwarted. To be sure, you do not understand it; it is only half-human, a creature of strange fears and stranger loves. The chances are that all your life, misled by mistaken morality, you have done what it did not want and left undone what it wanted. Now you must study it"—or let us study it, with the compensation not to the owner of the beast furnishing the entertainment, but to the observer.

If this new freedom imposes no shackles on action it does not hesitate to limit thought. "Do what you please," we are told in effect, "but do not expect to be able to think what you please, for you can not."

It may be that we are crying for the moon, but there are those of us so stubbornly self-willed that we'd almost be willing to be bound by conventions as to conduct if we could only retain our simple belief in our freedom to think independently of ancestral, childish or racial inhibitions; to think, if we wish, that our thinking measures the extent of our divergence from and not merely our relation to our great-granduncle, the *amœba*.

Said one college freshman in defiant despair: "I won't be governed by what psychology says I've got to think and feel! I won't! I won't!"

"Nonsense," said his instructor firmly.

And nonsense says a large division of scholastic science which, as I mentioned, differs surprisingly from the less didactic conclusions of scientists in the van of discovery.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Don't you yourself object to being told that your hope of reaching any independent conclusion is quite futile? I confess I object, not merely to the idea of a cramped mind, but to the mold into which ambitious analysts try to cramp it. It's true that the most insulting diagnoses are usually those marked feminine, but how do you like this estimate of your own sentiments:

"Man's love for woman is founded upon shifting and variable standards. Women like to think—and men have let them think it—that men pay homage to a particular woman because of her intellectual ability, her artistic attainments, her depth of sentiment, or some other sterling quality that, quite rightly, ought to call forth admiration. But that is not true. Man falls in love because of none of these attributes. Man loves because the face, the form, the color of the eyes or hair, the sound of the voice, please him. He may, of course, also value in addition the qualities of character that the woman imagines she is being loved for. But none of these really influence him. His urge is sensual. . . . Such love is bound to be more or less unstable and undependable."*

Granted that these conclusions of a popular psychologist may be generally true, are you willing to accept them without protest for yourself?

They are typical enough of one school. But of course theories which achieve publication and presumable effect upon the popular mind are hard to combat seriously because of their very diversity. Now you have them and now you haven't. "That is no longer accepted"; "later discoveries tend to disprove this." "His is the layman's conception of the case; to the scientific mind it is entirely different." Thus and thus do they wriggle away when you pin them to the point. Divided they stand.

But the fact is that the Freudian foundation carried from the first seeds of decay which are now beginning to sprout. Already the great discoveries are being qualified, and some have been openly attacked. Especially has it been difficult to maintain the theory of the manifestation of opposite qualities by which it be-

*Louis Bisch, M. D., in *Plain Talk* for December, 1927.

AND A LITTLE CHILD SHALL LEAD THEM

came the fashion to prove that all the saints were somewhat defective and all the heroes weaklings. When propounded by robust persons disclaiming all puritanical restrictions the retort was too obvious that by their own count their inner selves must be driving reform spirits, disappointed circuit-riders or suppressed missionaries. If even the most learned gentleman informs us pityingly that our opinions are the texture of illusion, founded upon childish impulse, prenatal influence and the left hind foot of a prehistoric rabbit, we may at least respectfully suggest that his own ideas may be, for all he can prove, no less humble in origin.* The whole argument carries with it that fine flavor of doubt which hangs about the Corsican's assertion that all Corsicans are liars.

24

AND A LITTLE CHILD SHALL LEAD THEM

IS there a Christian school of psychology?

It may be that one is developing. For the essential of Christianity is the idea of sonship—that all men are the children of God and therefore equal. And the newest school of psychology, that of Behaviorism, postulates the equality of infants at birth and their corruption only through wrong teaching. This is of course the hopeful Christian attitude as opposed to the sad Jehovistic or Freudian heritage of doom.

As nearly as a lay mind can grasp the difference, the Freudians traced sexual tendencies back as far as childhood and argued that they were ineradicable because inherited. But the Behaviorists traced them to babyhood, found their actual origin in physical sensation, and so proved that they could be controlled. The child's exposure to the tradition-hampered manners of his elders comes so swiftly in our life that the practical results may be indistinguishable from the effect of heredity, but it is gratifying to learn that we are at least free born. If we are given equity to start with

*For one of the most interesting of these "*tu quoque*" discussions see the Appendix, "The Unconscious Idea of Male Superiority in the Writings of Freud," in Paul Bousfield's *Sex and Civilization*.

our fight is with this life, unhampered by gifts from questionable ancestors—and whose ancestors aren't questionable if you go far enough back?

Dr. John Watson would presumably not consider it a compliment to be told that in their democratic optimism his theories are eminently Christian. His own worst condemnation of the Freudian school is to say that their miracles are on a level with the miracles of Jesus. He is skeptical of grown-up salvation and thinks it as hard for an adult to be successfully reconditioned as for a zebra to change its stripes. But Christ, too, said that salvation was easier for the child mind, and specified rebirth as the remedy for maturity's errors. And even spiritual birth is not always an easy process.

Another parallel between Christianity and Behaviorism is the distrust with which both have been regarded at the start, since both advanced disruptive doctrines. Doctor Watson appears further to have lost caste with his scientific brethren when he deserted research for advertising and began confiding his opinions to popular periodicals, somewhat as Saint Paul when unappreciated by the Hebrews turned to the Gentiles. But to the unscientific mind this bid for its approval is no great sin, and to this mind at least Doctor Watson's experiments on five hundred babies in Johns Hopkins are an impressive basis for his conclusions.

BOTH Behaviorist and Freudian schools, of course, fail to account for what the religionist would call an immortal soul, and what the romantic individualist would call an independent mind.

If you are the expression of your parents' self-expression, and they of theirs, and so on back to the first fish, you can hardly be said to possess any underived or independent character. You are merely a conglomeration of atavistic instincts. On the other hand, if you are the victim of your education you are not much

better off; this personality you have thought your own is not you but a bundle of acquired ideas.

But if the psychologists fail satisfactorily to account for the essential *you*, they have, at least, accounted convincingly for the frailties of human nature, and like authors of the Adam story in Genesis they may do us some service in showing us what to avoid. For while we may follow instincts or habits blindly there is in most of us an objection to following them consciously.

The Freudian here offers less apparent hope than the Behaviorist only because an instinct seems stronger than a habit. But how many so-called instincts do we habitually overcome, not from puritanical morality or fear of criticism or other shameful repression, but simply because our own saving common sense declares them undesirable or impossible!

So often it seems that we do not instinctively avoid trouble, we instinctively make for it. There is about our senses a frequent impulse toward torture of ourselves or of others, a desire for thrills that takes no thought of consequences. Consider, for example, the impulse to suicide many people feel in high places; the fascination of throwing one's self into a rushing river or before an express train. The impulse is definite enough to many people, and requires conscious suppression, yet the suppression is not regarded as dangerous.

So with a variety of other impulses as productive of discomfort in their own way, such as the instinct to look at unpleasant things. An old book of logic relates the story of an ancient philosopher who passed the bodies of certain criminals which he did not wish to view, but which his eyes desired to behold, so that he went back after passing safely by, stretched his eyes furiously, and said to them, "Gaze, you brutes, upon this horrible sight, and be satisfied!"

Such unwilling interest in the horrible might be classified by the biologist as an inheritance from predatory ancestors none too careful about the quality of the prey. From similarly undesirable predecessors—of the cat tribe, these—he would derive those im-

pulses of cruelty which occur to many minds where they are instantly stifled by the civilized conscience. Impulses there are of the sort that leads the savage mind to make clowns of cripples; impulses to mischief for its own sake, "*miching mallecho*," cruel mischief that may range from the comparative harmlessness of tripping a waiter with a load of dishes to the heinousness of kicking a crutch away from a man with one leg. Impulses such as these are not obeyed in decent society. They only come to the front when accidents happen and we find ourselves convulsed by nervous giggles at an incident which everything conscious in us would have prevented; they are "released" by comic strips and custard-pie comedies.

Similarly, going from unreasoning impulse to impulse based upon some semblance of reason, how many of us have felt acute desire to do violence to persons regarded, in our saner moments, with esteem and affection. Parricide is rare, yet how many of us have yearned for fleeting seconds to injure our beloved parents. How many parents in their turn have refrained from child murder, how many more from adolescent murder! Nearly all of us have restrained ourselves at one time or another from throttling our dearest friends.

All these unruly impulses and desires, instincts if you like, we have learned to overcome. Civilization is dependent upon their stern repression, and no liberty-loving student of the human mind urges their expression.

Only the sex impulse remains in polite society. Although it dates as far back into savagery as the rest it remains because it alone, of them all, has been regarded as essential to the survival of mankind. It has not been considered necessary or advisable during recent centuries (except in time of war) that the average man should be cruel, murderous or unclean, but it has been thought well that he should marry and beget a family. We have chosen this one impulse for sanctification above the rest.

Until now Freudian psychology in its very eagerness to worship has torn the sacred veil before the altar. More than the

churches which honor material life with the forms of beauty and decency, the psychologists send us back, begging and desperate, in search of a spiritual universe. They tear away the last shreds of hypocritical dependence on ceremony when they inform us that an old maid's mind may be more concerned with sex than that of a married woman with seven children, just as they reduce the pride of material life to absurdity by tracing the origin of lust to the infant discomfort of severance at birth.

The same service of *reductio ad absurdum* is performed by the Behaviorist discovery that the one desire common to humanity from its first breathing moment is the desire for comfort. If each infant reaction is traceable to physical pleasure or physical distress, sexual and other habits which we believe authentic are implanted, not native to our minds. And we do not escape racial inheritance after all, for the habits taught us in our unlucky infancy are those handed down in the same way from generation to generation. We merely receive this racial inheritance outside instead of inside the womb.

But let us apply the Behaviorist reasoning to human tradition. If our infant wails or gurgles of delight arise from bodily sensation it seems reasonable that those traditions which we dignify as natural instincts had a similar origin in the early days of the race.

Eons ago a lonely bit of pulpy matter afloat in the ooze discovered, perhaps, a sensation of comfort and security in contact with another bit of pulpy matter. Coming down the ages more complicated animals found the touch of other furry bodies a welcome protection against cold night air. So began and was perpetuated that "animal magnetism" which we have come to consider attraction for the sake of race preservation.

Parenthetically we may wonder if the other great instinct for self-preservation to which we trace the inclination to war is not as humble in its beginning. As the natural result of physical comfort is affectionate expansion, so the natural result of physical discomfort is belligerency. A baby's angry cry and clenched fist

are declarations of war against the world, regardless of occasion more reasonable than a tummyache or a scratchy blanket.

And thus in the minds of savages—minds of two- or three-year-old intelligence as we rate it—it seems easy enough to account for the spread of warfare and petting. It is the educated conscience which must justify both on higher grounds, call nature and the rest of humanity as witnesses and evolve important-sounding excuses for its acts.

Now psychology ties knots in our respectable clothing and points to us as naked cowering children. The timid mind may swallow the insult, but the stronger ego then and there resolves to grow up if only to secure revenge.

And if the psychologist tells us we can not grow we may return to fight him on the physical field, where no one can deny the possibilities of change.

AFTER all perhaps the affectionate cell which sought another cell for its physical comfort started something far more important than the next generation. To reach its mate it had to move. In moving it learned something about the world, found, it may be, what seemed a better place to live. In finding a better place and moving to it necessary changes were made and so there was diversification, progress, better ooze and eventually better cells. The cell itself, we may safely assume, made its changes without thought of posterity; it sought only for self-improvement, and nature took care of eugenic matters.

In more complicated organizations geologic history, by showing how changes in structure have followed change of circumstances, indicates that what we wish and try to be we may in time become. A college freshman learns, though he may not apply, the truth that disused faculties atrophy and are minimized and finally lost, while faculties made necessary by new uses are developed.

This disposes summarily of the argument that because things are so now they were so ordained in the divine plan and are irrevocable. To the evolutionist the existence of certain organs reveals the past but not the future. We have learned to accept with equanimity past changes in organic structure, even when they affected nearer relatives than the eohippus or the pterodactyl. Yet who knows what sentimental advantages were laid aside with tails? Many animals seem to derive great satisfaction from their possession; as an emblem of pride they receive careful consideration and in many cases, as for example a fox-terrier's, they prove a valuable aid to self-expression.

Now that we are willy-nilly tailless are we to stop our own evolution merely because we have acquired brains and a little knowledge of the past? Are the lower animals to have a power of progress denied to the species that has developed conservatives able to say, "Thus far and no farther.—We are It"?

It may be as foolish for us to be satisfied with our present situation as for the crudest fish to have been satisfied with his. The survival of the fittest means the survival of those best fitted to adapt themselves to new conditions. "Self-preservation" is only the obverse of the law of progress, for we are safe in a changing world only as we are able to go ahead. The universe is not static. The impulse toward progress is, in fact, the only impulse that is legitimately behind all our lesser impulses, wise or unwise. In time a psychologist may point out that the so-called primary urges are not primary but secondary, being simply effects of the desire for improvement, for the movement toward perfection that is life.* If that desire is life we are living most deeply and securely when we follow it, not when we stick fearfully where we are and grab only what we can reach without adventure.

*This has in fact already been pointed out in its negative aspect. Jung says (*Theory of Psychoanalysis*, p. 116): "The libido avoids the object which is so difficult to attain and demands such great efforts, and turns towards the easier ones, and finally to the easiest of all, namely the infantile phantasies, which thus become real incest-phantasies. . . . That is to say, the incest-phantasy is of second and not of causal significance, while the primary cause is the resistance of human nature against any kind of exertion."

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

To be sure, the first adventurers in any cause may expect derision. No doubt the first fish who retired to a mud bank to develop lungs was regarded by his former associates as a freak and a failure who never did have really good gills and never seemed to enjoy swimming like a normal fish. He was a poor fish, if you asked them.

But derision, the helpful psychologists tell us, is only compensation for fear and envy. The whole question of conscious evolution seems to scare people by its immensity, though the fact is that we do apply its possibilities in minor matters, and scientists do not hesitate to make such remarkable utterances as that of Prof. William Brown, of Oxford, in a recent lecture at Yale:*

"There is nothing to prevent us from holding the view that, although self-conscious mind may have developed out of simpler forms of biological process, it gradually achieves a greater and greater degree of independence, and is able to react upon the body with an increasing degree of freedom and determination of psychical activity, and eventually may survive physical death."

It may be, of course, that when we attempt conscious evolution we shall find ourselves in the position of the octopus who, when asked

"When you swim, which leg do you wiggle first?
The right-hand leg in front?
The right-hand leg behind?
The right-hand leg in front of the right-hand leg behind?
Or the right-hand leg behind the front right-hand leg?
Or do you begin with one of the left-hand legs?"†

was unable to swim at all. Self-consciousness is a serious handicap in any physical action. But as organic changes more or less marked have followed in every case upon the adoption of different methods of living, we may as well assume that they would

*Published in his book, *Science and Personality*.

†"A Tragedy of the Deep," from *Noah an' Jonah an' Cap'n John Smith*, by Don Marquis.

occur whether consciously or unconsciously invited. It seems likely that our greater danger is in attempting to postpone to future generations changes which have fallen due, as religion lost its dynamic quality by postponing heaven to another world.

The possibilities of immediate change in the individual cosmos merely through change in the point of view are well known to the philosopher, who has been pointing out the metaphysics of the case for many centuries. But he now has reinforcements from a new quarter—oddly enough from the scientific group which points to outside stimuli as the origin of all human action.

Orthodox physicists have always resisted any claim from the metaphysician to affect organic change. They might acknowledge the sway of the mind in ills affecting the nervous system or systemic habits; further than this it was useless to argue.

Now comes the Behaviorist school not only proving nervous reactions but fearlessly suggesting that organic actions and secretions show the effect of "conditioning" or applied stimuli. True, the Behaviorist stops his stimuli on the outside, but in his very effort to prove the origin of thought through outside stimuli he has resorted to the creation of a "word-world" which, he acknowledges, takes the place of the objective world in supplying the stimulus. The Behaviorist baby who smiles at the red apple learns in time to smile at the word apple, and so opens his infant mind to the influence of an idea.

The next step is to admit that the intelligent adult mind may learn to discriminate among ideas as the child discriminates among sensations, and eventually respond with the same perfect physical coordination to the ideas which reason approves.

The Behaviorist stops too soon to be of practical help to the grown-up mind. But the materials are there. Once you admit the possibility of mental stimulus you have a lever that will move the world; that may even, in Christian phrase, overcome it. For at this point the "reconditioning" of the Behaviorist becomes the conscious evolution of my grandfather, or the Christian doctrine of regeneration and self-redemption.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

At present we do not change ourselves easily because our self-applied mental stimuli—that is, our reasons for wanting to be different—are not so strong as the outside stimuli which are forcibly applied by tradition and herd instinct. We are not wholly convinced that new habits are desirable or that old habits are dangerous. Hence the change is not irresistible to us. Battle is on between the Christian moral teaching that wrong or irresponsibility brings trouble and right or control brings rewards, and the natural man's hope that there is after all no justice in the world. Most of us dissipate our energies by fighting first on one side and then on the other. But when we are really convinced of advantages accruing to us from a given course our behavior will be as "instinctive" as could be desired. We shall put off the "old man," as Saint Paul would say, the moment we discover him to be an actual incubus.

Though lower schools of scientific thought tend to make science a limitation, most far-seeing scientists appear to share a conviction of humanity's ability to change. Men whose minds range widely through the universe are not long content with the material cosmos because, as Mr. Chesterton has pointed out, it is too small—"the thing has shrunk." If your mental activity accustoms you to deal in light-years and wrap your consciousness around Einstein's explanations of time and space, to dabble in extra dimensions and quibble over quantum, you can not be held back from metaphysical speculation.

The standpat materialist, in short, is actually the non-scientist to whom matter is solid, impenetrable—not a flummery thing to be X-rayed and dissolved by the microscope into particles. The materialist sees a bar of iron and feels its weight, decides it may be a fatal weapon or a heavy burden, and is impressed. But—says the scientist—"I investigate its properties and find that it consists almost wholly of 'empty space,' with a number of tiny particles moving about in it at enormous speeds."* Or, if you

*Haldane, *Possible Worlds*.

TOWARD ETHICS?

prefer a less recent summary: "All that we know about matter is that it is the hypothetical substance of physical phenomena, the assumption of the existence of which is as pure a piece of metaphysical speculation as is that of the existence of the substance of mind."* Thomas Huxley speaking. He can say it even more emphatically: "The fish of immortal memory, who threw himself out of the frying-pan into the fire, was not more ill-advised than the man who seeks sanctuary from philosophical persecution within the walls of the observatory or of the laboratory. . . . The most elementary study of sensation justifies Descartes' position, that we know more of mind than we do of body; that the immaterial world is a firmer reality than the material."

27

TOWARD ETHICS?

IT is in accordance with the best tradition, then, that modern scientific writers indulge in wild speculations involving change in the human organism, and confess to apocalyptic visions of the end of the world. It is even allowable for my optimistic grandfather, if he likes, to construct a new heaven and a new earth as he did in *Back to Methuselah*; such a construction is actually more permissible, scientifically speaking, than the common assumption that we shall go on like this for ever.

Moreover, his latest linking of science and morality in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* is mild conservatism compared with the program laid out in Haldane's *Daedalus*: "Science . . . is man's gradual conquest, first of space and time, then of matter as such, then of his own body and those of other living beings, and finally the subjugation of the dark and evil elements in his own soul."

Conquest must advance because the tendency of applied science, Haldane continues, is to magnify existing evils—as in the case of war—until they become too intolerable to be borne.

**Essay on Sensation and the Sensiferous Organs.*

"Moral progress," he adds, "is so difficult that I think any developments are to be welcomed which present it as the naked alternative to destruction, no matter how horrible may be the stimulus which is necessary before man will take the moral step in question. . . . Whether in the end man will survive his accessions of power we cannot tell. . . . It is only hopeful if mankind can adjust its morality to its powers."

As a result of the feud between science and religion mentioned in connection with evolution, the practical and progressive main divisions of science, as distinct from the more nebulous bodies of the mental investigators, have offered no help in the moral adjustment. The modern engineer or chemist or biologist leases you his powers on a strictly commercial basis. His miracle has no ethical connection; it is all there in the physical apparatus. He makes no effort to convert you or even to influence you; you may in the course of human events influence yourself, but his pride it is to have no dealings with your soul.

Thus Haldane concludes that "The question of what we will do with these powers is essentially a question for religion and æsthetics."

But is it not possible that the scientific resembles the Christian revolution in supplementing its silence, as Christianity supplemented its preaching, with useful implications in the signs following? Perhaps the ethics so implied are merely uncoded. For the scientific miracles are not, however solidly material they may seem, without their effects upon us—our essential, not merely our physical, selves. It shows a nice fraternal tact—or perhaps merely the primitive instinct to hide under a taboo—to measure the power of the mechanistic age in terms of the horse. In fact, of course, it is measured in terms of man.

The man who can lift by moving a lever weights that he could never dream of budging with his muscles, drive an automobile many times faster than he can run, see through lenses with more accurate or more penetrating vision than through his unaided eyes, has in effect not only magnified but multiplied himself. He has

TOWARD ETHICS?

approached a little nearer to omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience, and he is many times the man he was.

Yet as with the Christian miracle the exercise of power is accompanied by an invitation to humility. The multiplied power is not will-power; man's place in the universe is made distinctly subordinate to law, even though he may accomplish wonders when he understands the law and applies it.

And though the scientific law is understood to be a material rather than a spiritual law, though the scientific miracles still for the most part require apparatus while the Christian spake and it was done, it can not be denied that the efforts of science to increase power have greatly refined it. Often the actual power exerted is in inverse ratio to the amount of visible apparatus; electricity is more powerful and less bulky than steam, wireless more ethereal and more effective than the cable. In time perhaps the scientist too will dispense with the clumsier levers.

Here the ethical requirement is increased self-control as a means of controlling refined and increased powers. We have had a striking instance of this in the attempted prohibition of alcohol as an industrial measure, and in the actual punishment of drunkenness on the part of chauffeurs or railway engineers. This sacrifice of individual liberty accompanying the scientific miracle of speed is an interesting parallel to the Christian's fasting as a preliminary to achievement.

Finally science, like primitive Christianity, has displayed a surprising indifference to man's generative powers and his family relationships. With so many methods of painless extension and reproduction at hand it is logical, indeed, that the humanistic event of our age should be not an Immaculate Conception but the discovery of a workable contraceptive. And so in its invitation to practise birth control while its leaders investigate the possibilities of immortality, science once more reminds us of the first-century millennialists.

It seems that religion and science may have had in common after all, at different stages in their careers, the principles of the

superiority of mental power over material, the prime necessity of individual self-control, and the relative unimportance of human generation. We might from this draw up for science as for religion another set of conclusions vitally affecting marriage, and discern certain points of similarity.

But let us not forget that we have one more chance to secure more definite directions; esthetics was recommended to us as another possible guide. Let us then consider esthetics, but not if you please by that rather depressing, one might almost say unesthetic name. Let us rather confine ourselves to the branch of esthetics which deals with taste and beauty in human relationships; let us, safely fortified by religion and science, now talk about romance.

THE PROMISES OF ROMANCE

“ROMANCE: the new, the strange, the marvelous.”

One patient teacher used to make successive classes in English literature write that definition of romance till they knew it by heart. It is doubtful if, at that, it ever quite displaced in student minds a notion that romance was when they lived happily ever after.

It is, of course, a matter of taste. To many minds the strangest and most marvelous thing in the world is the pursuit of happiness by way of domesticity. At any rate we may agree that romance is actually the story of mankind's pursuit of happiness, whether in new and strange paths or over a beaten track. Romance is the wish come true, the sheer substance of faith—and so it is recognized by writers as far apart as Mr. Kipling and Mr. Cabell as identical with real religion.

If it were not otherwise obvious the connection might be seen in our interchange of the terms “realist” and “materialist,” meaning one who is blind alike to romantic and to spiritual values.

Romance in plain fact is a mode of prayer for those who do not pray in the accepted manner; it is also a form of prophecy

THE PROMISES OF ROMANCE

acceptable, as certain clever novelists have discovered, to a public suspicious of the seer. It is, in short, humanity's best conception of things as they ought to be, and as it is somewhat freer than the church in its approach to heaven it is a better barometer of the sort of heaven people want.

Of course it is not perfect, even as a gauge. Romance is also like orthodox religion in the sense that to secure either publication or a pulpit it is necessary to conform, in some measure, to the rules laid down by those who manage the game. Nevertheless, it may be said with safety that the world is fairly well divided between people who are writing in novels or plays or poems their hopes for themselves and for the world, and people who are reading to learn what the possibilities may be. On the one hand, we have eager scribes setting down what any publishers' reader comes to recognize as personal wishes, and on the other, people who are ever more eager to hear a song than to obey a law. In short, an unorganized clergy and laity headed hopefully for heaven by way of the printed page.

With the writing clergy the same difficulty prevails as with the other sort—the doubtful effect of education. Writers, like other preachers, rarely receive inspiration direct from above. They go through a period of early training in which they learn from those who have gone before; in which, like ordinary laymen, they are influenced by what they read. And God help them if their reading has been foolish.

God help us all, in fact, if we can not learn somehow from books about those matters so essential to our happiness, and so neglected by our instructors along other lines.

But if we can not be sure of a recipe for heaven, at least we can see by casting our eyes carelessly over the fiction field just what the world in general is thinking. We can, by comparing current and past fiction, mark what progress has been made; for the changes in literary taste have followed closely upon and sometimes outstripped the changes in *mores*. And it can no longer be said that literature reflects only the cloistered mind; for recent

years have seen, in America at least, an amazing democratization.

Within my own recollection the words "best seller" signified opprobrium; a popular novel was a thing to be sniggered at by the critics and avoided by the best people. Now all that has been changed. The public that moves its lips when it reads, instead of moving them through the low art of Laura Jean Libbey or E. P. Roe, is absorbing with its luncheon soda the high art of Mr. Dreiser or Mr. Anderson, to whom the critics are more than kind. Your frowsy member of the class of '32 is chuckling not over the *Police Gazette* but over the *American Mercury*.

All of which may mean to you that public taste has improved or that criticism has lost its kick, according to whether or not you admire the productions of the ascendent school.

By adverse critics the popularity of this school is generally attributed to its preoccupation with one subject: it has become an axiom that the vulgar popular mind knows little about morality, spirituality or even intellectuality but will have heard about sex. And will willingly hear more.

But to condemn the present best sellers as "sex books" is surely nonsense if the term is meant to be a distinction between them and their predecessors in fiction. It is possible to name on one's fingers the novels that have not been concerned with sex to a greater or lesser degree.

This does not prove that sex as a subject is greatly important. It does, however, prove that with a world already divided into two camps it is next to impossible to produce real literature without dealing with both sides. It proves in short that sex is a handicap, that we can only find happiness when we have learned to balance in some way the qualities which we have foolishly fenced off as masculine on the one hand and feminine on the other, so that in romance we are eternally uniting men and women as symbols of this balance. And shall we blame the world because its greatest concern is to find out how the combination can be satisfactorily managed?

THE main difference between the present and the past is not the discussion of sex but whether sex is regarded as a pleasant and simple or an unpleasant and difficult problem. Even if we agree that hero and heroine are to live happily for ever, after overcoming suitable obstacles, we differ widely in the space of a decade about the nature of the obstacles and the conditions of happiness.

As one interested in human progress, I must decline to believe that the present type of literary production is as vicious in its influence as that of the saccharine school which taught every girl that the only real joy was found when he clasped her in his arms and she buried her head on his shoulder.

Nowadays we are forgetting even the phraseology of the novel that flourished around the turn of the century, but in its emphasis on sex—that is, on sexual differences—it can arouse acute impatience and even wonderment in a generation emancipated from the minor limitations if not from the major one. “She rubbed her cheek against his shaven one”—but shaving is no longer a mysterious rite to her since barber’s shears have clipped those curls that once tantalized our hero. “She buried her face in his tobacco-scented coat sleeve”—once this was a favorite occupation of the repentant heroine in the absence of a wronged lover. Now all she needs to do is to sniff her own sleeve, and if she doesn’t like it to change her brand of cigarettes.

Examples of this sort of thing can be culled indefinitely from popular novels of pre-war vintage. “Dainty feet that scarce crushed the turf she trod on yet left an impress on his heart” . . . But extension sole Ground Grippers, size seven and a half, prescribed in freshman physical training, leave a deeper impression on the grass and perhaps none at all on the man. “His eyes caressed the alluring feminine curves of her figure”—but that was before they began selling Boyshform brassières.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

After all these excitements it was merely a case of ending the last chapter with "Cabby, drive to the Little Church Around the Corner." That settled it. Those, indeed, were the good old days.

Good old days when girls who imbibed such tosh as their only way of learning about the world cultivated curls and curves and small feet and dutifully settled down to do nothing else in that station in life in which Providence had placed them until their knights should come riding, fall a willing victim to the curls, etc., and carry them away to plenty of money and endless bliss. Good old days when the heroine's sole problem was that of the North-west Mounted Police; when those who succeeded, as many of them did, in getting their men had no conception whatever of their future obligations or of what the future might reasonably hold. Good old days in which the average girl's notion of a man was of a shaved cheek, tobacco-scented coat sleeves, instant susceptibility to her charms, and permanent provision of a living.

Tolstoi in *The Kreutzer Sonata* registered, among other protests, a vigorous one against this discreetly rosy romance:

"In all the novels are described down to the smallest details the feelings of the characters, the lakes and brambles around which they walk; but, when it comes to describing their *great* love, not a word is breathed of what *He*, the interesting character, has previously done, not a word about his frequenting of disreputable houses, or his association with nursery maids, cooks, and the wives of others."

But this objection, like the literature it criticizes, is a thing of the past. To-day's novels leave us in full possession of all the worst scandal about the hero, and more, since *She* has now become an interesting character too, about the heroine; so that the problem is not can they get each other but can they stand each other.

INDEED so careful is our present school of writing to point out flies in the ointment and rifts in the lute, to provide what reviewers call "a tonic dose of reality" and blurb writers "a fine frankness," that it is obviously a reform school, and it has been not inaptly called the Emetic School. As an antidote to too much sugar we now have to swallow too much mustard.

Perhaps the mustard is good for us, but some of us are coming to make faces over the dose not because it is sharp but because it is ready prepared. The real objection to art-with-a-purpose is not the purpose but the practise, so attractive to the amateur, of invention to fit a ready-made formula. We have no right to quarrel with the modern writer because his conclusions are different from those to which earlier moralists have accustomed us. But we have every right to quarrel with him if we suspect him of drawing conclusions in memory of a semester of psychology, or if the protest that there are in real life no such animals as his characters can only be met with the answer that they do exist in Freudian case-books.

Characters out of case-books seem to lack something—not guts certainly, but other organs that may be important too. We noticed that the psychologists accounted for everything but an immortal soul, and this perhaps is what we miss in psychological fiction. In telling us quite all about the actions of his people the modernist sometimes seems to lose their essential selves. Or he may tell us their darkest thoughts in detail, but leave off the high light that will make us see them in the round.

This is not noticeable when he is dealing with the people we know, for then we can supply his deficiencies. Thus his greatest success is in showing up the badness of good people, in pointing a telltale finger at the missionary who breaks the seventh commandment or the good woman who goes about making people miserable. Their chronicler may fail to make it clear that the missionary's adultery does not prove the commandment wrong

but him wrong, with a wrongness exceeding that of other men only because he professes to know better. Often he neglects to tell us that it is no sin to know better if you can. And in creating the obnoxious good woman he may, intoxicated by emancipation from chivalrous restraint, endow her with contradictory attributes. Yet we fill in both pictures for ourselves as we would any other sketchy caricature, because we are familiar with the types.

His real trouble is when he undertakes to show us the goodness of bad people, with whom many of us are less familiar. Then it is that he falls down with a dull sickening thud. There seem to be in modern fiction few realistic rogues, fewer convincing painted ladies—for these you must go to the literature of the, in this respect, far more knowing and clear-sighted Victorians.

This at first glance seems puzzling, for though his good people are perhaps unavoidably synthetic, why should the untrammelled modern resort to synthetic sin? He can not be without the genuine, when so much of our literature for the past decade has been written by the self-confessed incontinent, that is by those who would in a less broad-minded day have been described as rakes and courtezans. At least a credulous follower of their work must so judge; for it is avowedly the literature of personal experience—intensely subjective, life as I see it, and when it is also avowedly “unmoral” and sensual there is but one conclusion to draw concerning the writers. It seems a pity when a sweet young poetess just out of English Two, or a sedate old maid who ought to know better, is self-revealed in the flesh tones of Rubens at his worst; one is tempted occasionally to suspect that it is only their art they have prostituted for the sake of gaudy jackets on the backs of their books. Yet they claim, in no uncertain terms, to know Life. . . .

Perhaps the answer is simply that we never know ourselves. While Victorian villains rang truer, the model hero and heroine were unconvincing. Now perhaps we have learned to depict

virtue from the proper distance, but vice is too close for accurate perspective. The present-day realist draws his harlots as kindly as if they leaned over his shoulder as he writes; he sees them perpetually crooning lullabies while they offer themselves kindly, thoughtfully, with a noble abandonment of selfish restraint.

He is such a dewy sentimentalist, that realistic writer; having learned about women, he is so youthfully enthusiastic about his *alma mater*. And when age has led him to religion, heaven help us; for he will then invite us to worship Mary the Mother not because she was a Virgin but because, to his view, she freely, frankly and courageously was not.

No doubt feminine prejudice is at the bottom of my feeling that this thing of idealizing frail heroines has been overdone. Really the fashion for dissecting their least beautiful aspects is not new; it began with Ann Veronica, and has carried logically through Jennie Gerhardt and the Marches, Iris and Janet, to Nina Leeds. All these ladies, be it noted—and it has in fact already been noted of some of them in a pleasant little essay by Katharine Fullerton Gerould—are the creatures of men writers, and similarly have not many of the masculine animals that prowl through fiction been clumsily drawn by women? Read “Moved by overmastering passion he crushed her to his heart,” and nine cases out of ten the author’s first name will be Marie or Ethel or Edith or Grace. As an intelligent man you have no doubt shuddered at the indignities heaped upon your sex by that curious anomaly, the lady novelist, but you have been well avenged.

To-day the morally fragile heroine capitalizes her fragility not only with her fellow characters but with the public at large. With an ingenuity equal to that of the ten-twenty-three thrillers in first imperiling and then saving the lady’s virtue, present dramatic successes are built upon situations requiring her virtue to consist in its sacrifice. And while the custom was for her to pawn her honor for the sake of the hero or an aged father, it is now laid frankly down for a more selfish though still somehow sacred purpose.

According to the new pattern we learn, for example, that a woman is perfectly justified in deserting a husband for any man who excites more of that feeling of physical tension which goes by the name of love among those unfamiliar with the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. A play by a well-known European author, produced on Broadway not so long ago, concerned a heroine who met just such a man. Moreover, her husband wasn't interesting anyhow. So she proposed to the would-be lover that he flee with her, first stealing enough to make sure her escape from the husband. But the lover hesitated at theft; she dropped him in disgust, resuming her respectable life; curtain.

Staid and conservative dramatic critics, in discussing this situation, referred to the lady as standing—stolen jewels in hand—for nobility and truth; condemned the hesitant lover as a weakling unworthy of her high trust, and considered the return to her husband—who, in his uninteresting way, loved her—as a tragic frustration.

Clearly, because she loved the other man or thought she did until he developed a moral streak, new-school ethics demanded that she run away with him. It was plainly her duty to give him rights already contracted, not to mention the other theft.

But suppose she had done all this. It must be remembered that her husband also loved her. Would it have been his duty to pursue her; to handle the laws against murder, say, with the same high courage she displayed about larceny? In that case he must have killed the other man, dragged her home by the hair and kept her there until the next man came along.

I ask these questions without malice toward the play in question but simply to point a more general inquiry about frank modern literature. I feel, in general, that even the most courageous of our writers fail to carry their propositions sufficiently far. If we are to extend to our affairs of the heart the principle of survival of the fittest—grab what we can, without fear of God and only a devil to take the hindmost—it seems that we are overlooking, in literature and in life, the fact that there are other

THE HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

primary passions besides lust. Jealousy is one. Why be any more civilized in one case than another? I want modernists who lay aside conventions and bravely follow their desires to follow all the human impulses and do what they'd like to do to their successful rivals, not just to substitute for the old code of restraint in love a new code of restraint in revenge. Why not, I mean to say, more murders?

31

THE HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

IN spite of the temptation, it is wrong to make fun of our iconoclasts merely on the ground of discrepancies in character drawing and motivation; for on moral grounds they are frequently right. They are keen enough in criticism, determined enough to prove the old ideas wrong even though they may not see clearly why they were wrong. And when they write books and plays with the high moral purpose of showing up the failure of old-fashioned monogamy they are doing a useful if not a very difficult job; we should not blame them merely because they are unable to offer a satisfactory substitute, whether in polygamy, polyandry or promiscuity.

They seem to perceive that the possessive form of love is a mistake, and that love itself is a necessity, without knowing anything to do except to do away with the legal aspects of possession. This makes them somewhat hopeless protestants. In O'Neill's *Strange Interlude*, for example, the dramatist's highly moral intention (if the terms of the Pulitzer award credit him with one, so can I) seems to be to prove that of the three types of masculine companionship possible to a woman, through her relations with husband, lover and sympathetic friend, the Platonic friendship best endures the test of time. Yet in the play, becoming hopelessly involved in biologic bondage (apparently it does not occur to them that any save moral bonds can be broken), the characters extend the interlude of idiotic impulse over a long, long lifetime, becoming rational only as the curtain descends on

their decrepitude. Only the recognized relationships are fruitful, after all: the husband makes a fortune, the lover begets a child, but the friend only talks and gathers roses in the garden.

It may as well be admitted that so far most friendships between men and women have proved as unsatisfactory. Yet the need for mental give-and-take between them is painfully apparent even in the play under discussion, which suffers from what seems an inability on the part of the author to comprehend feminine character. The men are all credible enough, to a woman at least, but Nina Leeds so obviously sprang full-panoplied from the brow of Freud that it is hard for a normal woman to take any interest in her.

To register only one specific complaint, with the physiological reasons carefully explained to us, the heroine at fifty puts away childish passions and goes into a graceful decline in which men mean nothing to her. As a matter of fact, any unbiased student of human nature must see that the vanity of women as vain as Nina is usually increased rather than diminished at this point in their lives, and *Cradle Snatchers* is a far more accurate picture of their reactions.

If I seem to harp unkindly on Mr. O'Neill's play it is because it offers, I think, a good example of what many writers to-day are trying to do, as well as a sustained discussion of sex in dramatic terms and an excellent example of the workings of one man's mind. As the speeches in the play proclaim the thoughts of characters preoccupied with sex, so the play itself proclaims the thoughts of a playwright preoccupied with the same subject. In this self-revelation I confess I find Mr. O'Neill more of a curiosity than Mr. Shaw. My grandfather is so correct in assuming the safety of making his women characters think as he thinks that it works the other way; I feel that I understand my grandfather. But I am not at home in the mind of Mr. O'Neill, which appears to have nothing in common with the Shavian mind except a fondness for writing long plays, and nothing whatever in common with mine.

THE HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

Yet one impatient with his conclusions, or lack of them, must respect his earnest moral conviction that something is wrong. In this conviction lies also the solid superiority of Mr. Dreiser, Mr. Anderson and other giants of the same Olympus. And out of all the welter of protest, the naive bad manners, the baroque schemes, we may gather that this rebellious generation has turned the glare of realism on orthodox marital arrangements, transferred its sentiment from legal to illegal sexual relations, and generally played the wild with established morality. But in a word it has simply restated the theories of Freudian psychology in terms comprehensible to the reading and play-going public. And the sum of those theories, we observed before, was that something is wrong.

If we believe that the same thing is wrong with all of us we naturally arrive at tolerance, and tolerance (for everybody but God and the romantic idealist) may truly be said to be the realist virtue. Never before, indeed, has literature urged such universal tolerance, amounting to the definite assumption that we are all in the same boat—and that not a ladylike liner with first, second and third cabins, but a small and rolling craft in a rough sea.

Now we expect the moral code of a life-boat to be abnormal and quixotic, and even absurdly sentimental. And indeed it seems true that the greatest distinction of this hard-boiled generation is an astounding sentimentality in its own way, a breath-taking breadth of mind in dealing with wrong-doers with whom it sympathizes. But no doubt all this has its place in the scheme of salvation. As we learn in college that Burns and Wordsworth taught the Anglo-Saxon world to appreciate birds and mice, and Dickens created a sympathy for down-trodden orphans, succeeding generations may look back upon ours as the era of awakened understanding of professional ladies, perverts and other victims of the tyranny of sex. Undoubtedly it is better to shed tears over the tardy discovery that "fallen women" are people than to regard them as hat-racks. For perhaps this sentimentality may lead to the sensible conclusion that there is no

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

person so abandoned that society can not be blamed for hiring her to serve an ignoble end, and thus we may get past the old-fashioned notion that a man may ever be "a gentleman in his vices."

It's true I did think all that had been settled well enough, and unsentimentally too, by my grandfather in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. But apparently it will take sentiment to do the trick, and of course there is nothing so criminal as dismissal of a problem on the plea of boredom. While people of good taste may deplore on such selfish ground the present emphasis on this branch of the subject, the fact remains that it is a subject difficult to overemphasize as long as it exists. When Mr. Mencken remarks that "Sex, at bottom, belongs to comedy in the cool of the evening and not to the sober business that goes on in the heat of the day," he is stating an impossibility; for if sex belongs anywhere the only way to keep it from being tragedy is to keep it in the daylight.

The fact is, of course, that anybody who agrees that sex is necessary and yet regards it as comedy is a moral idiot grinning at the sight of blood. The man who can see no serious evil in sex is intellectually on a level with the woman who can see no serious evil in a sweatshop. Without undue sentimentality we may admit that the evils due to the labor of bearing children are at least as great as the evils due to other labor—even though, considering some people's children, the results may not seem so important.

While the majority of mankind still struggles under a sexual handicap as trying as the need for food, we must give the evils of sex a place in literature along with the evils of capitalism. We can only regret that the writers who point out these evils most plainly seem so hopeless about a solution. But it is possible to learn even from an unsuccessful experiment. Truth, we are told, is mighty and will prevail; the ark will be borne to Zion whether the priests are crowned or bound before it—and to the reverent and reflective reader, fiction often seems to maintain its

correspondence with truth without the conscious collaboration of its author. This perhaps explains the mission of the Emetic school.

HAVE we no Behaviorist literature?

At first glance it may seem that Behaviorist theories would hardly lend themselves to fiction. It's true we have had as yet no play with its setting a nursery and its dialogue openings: "Ah, goo!" "Da dad!" and "Glub."

But while the contribution of Freudian psychology was the discovery of tragic maladjustment, the contributions of a later psychology we saw to be a comforting assurance of equality combined with a helpful *reductio ad absurdum* of human importance. These things, translated into literature, bring us to that Comic Spirit which has been defined as a sense of proportion.

Now that we are in a position even to mention proportion we see that while sex looked at from the standpoint of realist necessity is a mountain at least as tall as the mountains of Nebraska, seen from another angle it may be quite a small mole-hill. Notice that we have not agreed with Mr. Mencken that sex is a comic matter; we have first achieved the detached view proper to comedy, and then discovered that sex has been reduced until, far from belonging to comedy, it hardly exists.

Serious consideration of sex must imply its effects in the moral and spiritual world, and so considered it has the monstrous significance of the thing out of place. That is why the realist is justified in making so much of it; it is no more a joke than the tyranny of an insane and illegitimate ruler.

In common decency it is necessary to take the realist seriously; he suffers, and indeed he must suffer if he is to get anywhere. He can not afford to sit peaceably under all his tragic maladjustments.

But when we have left him to get a breath of air his universe itself dissolves as the bar of iron dissolves under the eye of the

scientist. We have reached the grown-up world where matter, *per se*, ceases to be crushing. We realize that sex considered as merely a physical fact is entitled to no more consideration than other physical facts. It must not be too frequently mentioned, that is, nor too largely considered in relation to the things which we who call ourselves civilized are sometimes willing to place before mere matters of food and warmth and rest. We conclude that from their own view of essential reality the realists might diversify a bit; when will they reveal the food-life of the hero as frankly as his love-life?

"In his teens," we might read, "Adolph was passionately fond of nut sundaes. But they disagreed with him, and freed from their thrall he found his very soul thrilling to corned beef and cabbage. These satisfied his inmost cravings for a time, but it could not last for ever. There were other attachments. . . . Then the forties, the dangerous age, brought a longing for those finer things of life that he had missed. It was inevitable then that truffles intrigued him, lobster allured him, *flet mignon aux champignons* got him in the end. . . ."

To the agonized realist, writhing first with hunger and then with indigestion, the comedian's best manners are an insult because they seem the product of his happy circumstances; he can afford to exercise politeness and self-control because he is well fed. But is it not possible that he is well fed because he is self-controlled and polite?

Coming back to the sex question, problems of sexual conduct perplex the tragedian because he magnifies them as, by putting on the buskin, he magnifies himself. The comedian, on the other hand, gains his happy ending logically because he has the easy control that comes, as the Behaviorist tells us, from actual conviction. His desire is automatically limited by a correct sense of the proportions of its object.

As no keener weapon than ridicule has yet been devised for the conviction of the human mind we may, I think, see great hope for deliverance from sexual difficulties in the popularity of

COMIC RELIEF

late of the works of Miss Anita Loos, my own admiration for which I have already expressed. Lorelei and Dorothy are compensation for a large number of appealing creatures, when you come to think of it; they are perfectly competent to deal with even the most sentimental young modernist.

As for the old-fashioned sentimentalist, of course he succumbed long ago. While a certain amount of what its more honest purveyors refer to as goo is still required for the success of the ordinary fictional or theatrical offering, the fact remains that there is a steadily growing demand for humor in love scenes, and humor with its accompanying sense of proportion is fatal not only to purple passion but to pink sentimentality. Even the musical comedy hero, who once sang worshipfully of his lady's physique, rhyming bliss with kiss and blue with true, now tells her in more complicated but more convincing trisyllables *Why I Feel at Home with You*:

"I've a sensible, comprehensible, great respect for you—
There's a dash in it of a passionate, tender feeling too."

You may notice in this tag something more significant than the small proportion of passion. The fundamental attitude is equality; there's none of that "There, there, little girl" stuff—which is of course why they feel at home. While tragedy is preoccupied with the sex problems of the unbalanced, comedy is producing characters that grow more and more nearly sexless. The reason is simply that comedy reflects polite life, in which sex differences are disappearing, while tragedy deals with the darkness in which they take refuge.

This observation is not original; you will find it, fifty years old, in Meredith's *Essay on Comedy*: "The comic poet dares to show us men and women coming to this mutual likeness; he is for saying that when they draw together in social life their minds grow liker; just as the philosopher discerns the similarity of boy and girl, until the girl is marched away to the nursery."

Now we find less similarity between a Bulwer-Lytton and a

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Locke hero than between a modern hero and a modern heroine; while in the modern autobiographical novel of the lighter sort similarity between the sexes is most marked of all. Whether the hero suffers through Eton and Oxford or the heroine is privately tutored and then goes to Girton, there is practically no difference between them, their thoughts or their experiences. Each sensitive soul suffers the same juvenile agony, commits the same adolescent mistakes and arrives in the same adult despair, finding happiness thereafter in the same hope that he or she has at last reached some glimmer of gumption. But throughout the exchange of names and pronouns would be entirely possible, and indeed in one *tour de force* recently published such a change does take place, and our hero becomes a heroine with no ill consequences.

If we hold to the scientific creed of open-mindedness we shall have to accustom ourselves to unexpected results. We need hardly be amazed if in time the sex-conscious school is supplanted even in popular favor by the sexlessness forecast in the novels just mentioned; somewhat as in the insect world, biologists point out, promiscuity may be followed by extinction of the mating impulse. A sample of such an outcome is discernible in our latest version of Galahad, in which Mr. Erskine shows us Lancelot's son seeking the Grail as an excuse to escape the tiresome seductions of Guinevere's court.

Even the most tragic line becomes comic by endless repetition. In that way perhaps we shall come to find one fine day that the Snake has turned into an angleworm, and the Apple has been made into applesauce.

33

"THY FACE IS FAR . . ."

AND now perhaps you have noticed something odd about this discussion of literature. In the beginning I proposed to talk about romance. There have been pages and pages about realism, and a bit about comedy, instead. Well, it seemed necessary in view of my general subject to discuss the literature

that dealt with sex, and it simply fell out that there wasn't much romance in that subject as treated in literature to-day.

Certainly there is no escape from a real world into the literature of realism; it's as tiresome as dreaming all night about the work you have done all day. And in the modern physiological romance whose characters are miscellaneous atoms and electrons whirling through space, attracting and repelling one another by what Mr. Dreiser calls the chemistry of their beings, there is somehow a complete absence of appeal to the really romantic mind. It's not that the chemistry idea is harder to believe than the old maids' tale which confused God with Cupid; credibility was never a romantic requirement. It's simply that in most romantic minds there is resentment against the formula, and most of all against the formula, "You can't win." Mr. Dreiser and Mr. Wells may be so entirely without ego as to be willing to be classified as masses or groups or alliances or leagues or blocs of atoms or electrons or whatever, wandering about attracted or repelled by similar or dissimilar combinations, but some of us feel more romantic fascination in the conceit of having something to decide for ourselves. At least if we are to yield to compulsion of any sort it must be to some irresistible conviction of the spirit, some marvelous and moving yet credible promise of ultimate perfection, and to no ordinary physical bondage; the romantic lover may swear fealty by the polar star, but "animal magnetism," the common or Garden variety of appeal, must by the very necessities of that oath leave him cold.

Perhaps the romanticist is more of a realist than he has been given credit for being. At least he is wise enough to look for happiness outside the material combinations whose satisfactions he knows must cease with age and loss of physical attraction, must decrease with illness and vanish utterly with death. A greedy and a perverse generation may demand all earthly delights as its just due, and hail those prophets who promise as well the joys which Mohammedanism defers to paradise, without the customary Moslem requisite of a death by fighting. Gratified realists may

hear from such prophets that we are not required to fight, only to accept the universe naturally, fearlessly, frankly and fully, with of course a knowledge of birth control and glanduction. But the romanticist, after one look at the prospectus, takes his white plume in the other direction.

Since romance is the pursuit of happiness he would hardly be frightened by a glimpse of any truly attractive heaven. He realizes that material things, though imperfect, are not to be despised as symbols of the eternal goal. But he reserves the right to choose his symbols, and in the matter of love any romantic observer knows that a rose or a red apple may mean more than can be expressed by complete cession of physical independence. Unless we are to assume that the lady feels more real tenderness for the pork packer she marries than for the lad who has only her lace handkerchief, we must detach the idea of love from its material consummation.

Still, we started out to search for romance and detachment is not enough. It may be comfortable; borne up by the Comic Spirit we may be cheerful about it, but after all our laughter has a brittle edge. Clearly we are better off than the weltering realists, but where *is* our romance?

Looking again to literature, we may observe that true romanticists have turned from the accepted forms of fiction to travel and history and folk-lore. We have developed a demand for "non-fiction," so called, though biographies and travelers' tales thus classified may display twice as much romantic imagination as a realistic novel.

And so we come back after all to the definition of romance as the "new, the strange, the marvelous." History seen in a new light, strange quirks in human nature, places visited with an eye for the marvelous have a fascination lacking in imaginary narratives when the imagination is weighed down by solid considerations. Romance is adventure, not vegetation. The romantic part of a fairy-tale is not the living happily ever after, it is the hunting and killing of the dragon.

"THY FACE IS FAR . . ."

Back in the beginning Romance carried with it a peculiar and awful splendor—the splendor of Rome. We feel this connection now only when we speak of Romance languages. But it was meant to suggest the round-the-world-and-back-again spirit that conquered Gaul and built Watling Street. It is own cousin to the word Romany, and if people can not see a connection between the Roman road and the Romany patteran it simply goes to prove that romance is not in them.

Even now true romance, deserting lovers' meetings fraught with no mystery and no danger even from public opinion, lingers in place names and folk-songs. It is still to be found by the careful searcher in china and books and laces and fans and snuff-boxes; in the Temple at Karnak and the shades of Battersea Bridge; in old brick houses and damp stone walls, behind hedges and down wells; in violins and tambourines and the hurdy-gurdy round the corner; on any road that climbs a hill, and in every sort of vessel that ever sailed the seas.

It is hardly to be found in sex; for there every approach has been mapped and measured, every depth sounded, innumerable others have been before us and left tiresomely detailed reports. We learn from reading that there was a time when the strange, the unusual, even the marvelous was represented by the other sex. That was the time of barred windows, of velvet masks and trailing mysterious cloaks and elusive perfumes. But even in those days people spoke of "conquests," proving that romance lay, after all, in surmounting difficulties. Now we all know that the days of conquest in that line are over, and no doubt you, as an intelligent young man, have discovered that considerably more adroitness may be displayed in escape.

As a working girl who must spend a good bit of her time listening to the woes of employers and co-workers, I have found a common theme of married men to be the mountains they might have climbed, the ruins they might have explored, the ships they might have sailed on if it hadn't been for the wife and kiddies. . . . And while deploring their sportsmanship I have

felt some pity for them, for no doubt they were led in their youth to believe that marriage would prove the Great Adventure.

Even now you will find, not so often in books as in magazine fiction, the repeated suggestion that adventure like charity may begin at home. But to a suspicious mind it seems a significant coincidence that the happy endings of these stories are tucked between advertisements of furnaces, breakfast foods, floor polish, plumbers' supplies, and other adjuncts of the happy household. If greater paid publicity were given to snow shoes, cork helmets, mosquito bars, pemmican, and similar accompaniments of polar or tropical exploration is it possible that our fiction might take a different tack?

But as for love . . .

There is only one flaw in the over-the-hills-and-far-away conception of romance: though we may find a new world over the hills we must take our old selves there. Some of us feel that it is not enough to escape from our surroundings, we must also escape from ourselves if we are to make our pursuit of happiness successful. And that is why—discarding the theory that marriage in itself, as the realists so accurately picture it, can prove the Great Adventure—the romantic mind can still dally with the idea of love. For real love, being unselfish, offers the only sure escape from self.

And while it may be hard to see much romantic promise in material contacts which have been only too carefully charted by science and licensed by public opinion, it is hopeful to remember that there remains a large unexplored territory of the mind. They may macadamize our Roman roads, and put Karnak on post-cards, but it will be many a day before men and women have done learning the intricacies of each other's thoughts.

To this exploration love offers the only possible approach. We do not open our mental houses to our enemies.

Nor do we open them easily at all. Of all the remaining romantic possibilities—and leaving out old-fashioned marriage, piracy and discovering the North Pole, but adding transoceanic

flying, mechanical invention and psychic research they are about as many as ever—the exploration of another mind is perhaps the most difficult. Certainly it is when the mind is subject to the dissimilarities of training, if not of nature, due to sex difference.

But when did difficulties daunt the hunter of dragons?

There's always the chance that an unknown element may prove a magic elixir, and an unexplored path the approach to heaven.

And if you stop to think of it, hard as we have tried to smother it with common sense the idea of the One Man and the One Woman has carried on through all our literature, so that even our realistic writing only substitutes a succession of other affairs for the succession of dangers which the hero has always had to meet before reaching his lady.

But this approach is destructive of romance because romance is inherent in the *first* thing. Mr. Kipling, who is still good authority on the subject of this chapter, once set down the observation that a man has but one virginity to lose.

The trouble with romance in the plural is that it invariably appears as burlesque. We have no faith in it. The penalty of making a mistake is feeling doubt thereafter, and the doubter is denied admission alike to fairyland and paradise.

In the end, perhaps, we may find the requirements of romance sterner, or at least more definite, than the demands made by religion and by science upon one who would be a performer of miracles. Yet if the demands are sterner the rewards are, to some eyes, even more perceptibly fair, and the directions as they are given in literature seem perhaps more practical. For all its branches, if you will use them, serve the one end; the realist tells us in nasty detail exactly what is wrong with material living, thus leading us away from temptation; the humorist pricks our lagging resolution, delivering us from evil, and finally the romanticist pipes so persuasively that we follow as a little child to his heavenly kingdom.

Always there is this promise to the child. The mad materialist of *The Kreutzer Sonata* scouts the idea of lifetime love by saying

that "only children can believe it." But religion has already told us that children are the preferred candidates for heaven, and science too has put its trust in the child mind.

Children have faith. If, as most of us suspect, anticipation is the greatest of all delights, we need not quarrel at perceiving ourselves in the position of the donkey eternally pursuing a wisp of hay held in front of his nose; for thus we may yet discover the secret of perpetual motion, and certainly we are provided with a matchless opportunity for pleasant progress.

Though in his apostrophe *To the True Romance* Mr. Kipling has pointed out first of all that it is of the very essence of romance to be far removed from this our war, distance can be no great handicap to the operation of a force that governs time and tide and bids the wavering stars stand still. If indeed as the reverent phrases of this litany suggest romance may prove a rule of higher mathematics than arithmetic, a spur to trust and a curb for lusty unwisdom, perhaps it is not too much to call it in the end "that lovely Truth" known only to the careless angels, and yet—this is the important thing—desired even from afar by the sons of men.

Most of us do not believe religion when it says "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing," or that "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." We do not even believe science when science calls matter a hypothetical substance. But we may find it in our hearts to believe romance when it tells us that our dreams are the tissues of enduring satisfaction, that there really is a solid gold El Dorado and a crystal-clear Fountain of Youth, and—some-where—a Princesse Lointaine.

WE have now examined briefly the various findings of Religion, Science and Romance. They were not, after all, so antagonistic; each had a pessimistic side offset by a hopeful revaluation of the universe in terms which reduced

the individual problem to childish proportions. By viewing the situation on the new scale a solution is suggested, and in each case the millennial promise is dependent upon self-control, a struggle with the material world, and a certain amount of propulsive faith in the possibilities of progress.

Of the three, Romance had the advantage of being, not a system imposed from without, but a literal reflection of humanity's hope. We may also say parenthetically that it had the advantage of comparative freedom from organized authority in its promulgation. At any rate we are safe, I think, in saying that Romance offers to most minds the best incentive to progress; though as we go ahead we may reserve the right to return to Science and to Religion for any ideas which may prove valuable.

And so we have the materials and the general recommendations for your experiment. Now we are ready to consider the actual plans of life from which you must somehow choose your own.

35

MORE OR LESS SINGLE

AT an earlier point I suggested that we divide the obvious courses of marriage and celibacy into practical and romantic marriage, and devotional or genuine and social or nominal celibacy. Moreover, I remarked that the accepted course for most men was nominal celibacy followed by practical marriage. Let us therefore begin our consideration of the various courses of action with this plan.

In case you are in any doubt as to what I mean by a distinction between genuine and nominal celibacy I will explain that by the former I mean absolute chastity and by the latter mere freedom from the ties of marriage, with no bar to promiscuity except the safeguards and concealments common in polite society.

Had I been born a little earlier than I was I might have found it impossible to understand this second form of celibacy as a prelude to marriage or as any other tenable state for an otherwise respectable person of either sex. No doubt it was always comprehensible to you although your intelligence may have vetoed it

as a course of action; but to me as a well-brought-up girl the idea that people could go calmly about sexual relationships with no thought of marriage was foreign and strange. Indeed I can remember looking on such cases first brought to my attention with horror and dismay only made endurable by my confidence that no one worth any real consideration would ever behave like that.

Even yet I find it hard to laugh at that girlish assumption, for any way you look at it its variance from what young men of my generation were taught—and were to do—was bound to cause me a great deal of trouble.

I was, however, born late enough to learn. Once I might have been informed that the disposition to promiscuity was a mysterious and peculiar masculine possession, constituting a cross to be borne with Christian charity by sweethearts and wives. I need waste no time trying to understand it, for it was of course beyond the comprehension of any nice woman. There were undoubtedly female creatures who were a party to the outrage but they, unspeakable beings worse than the worst man, were likewise outside the pale—permanently outside.

It happens, however, that within my own fairly respectable circle of acquaintances I have numbered women who are, in these days, living proofs of the fact that the instinct for promiscuity is not limited to men. It happens, moreover, that I live in an era when free speech permits us all to learn more about one another's lives than we ever knew before, so that I do not even despair utterly of a grasp of masculine motives.

And I have devoted some time to an attempt to understand the mental processes of those men and women who are untrammelled in their sexual behavior by any of the inhibitions which I once considered general property.

The principle—for there really is a principle—behind what the Puritan sees as outrageous misconduct I now believe to be what may be called the principle of common clay. It is simply that sex attraction is a physical fact, a general, common feeling

ARE PROSTITUTES PEOPLE?

which can be experienced in different places and in different company.

You remember we have said all along that sex is a physical attribute deserving of no especial consideration except when it invades the mental and spiritual fields. And this common clay conclusion as to sex attraction at least grasps the philosophical truism that matter and spirit are not synonymous, and that matter is essentially unimportant.

But does not the assumption that sex attraction is a common and general and—most dangerous of all—an unimportant thing make for promiscuity and general immorality?

Certainly one conclusion that can be drawn is that expression of this attraction is an incident of no great importance, to be indulged and forgotten. But let us, if you don't mind, defer the moral question raised here. Our concern just now is practical living, and the immediate practical result of the conclusion just mentioned is unquestionably prostitution.

36

ARE PROSTITUTES PEOPLE?

PROSTITUTION was formerly regarded, in public at least, as an unmitigated evil.

Here and there professors who had enjoyed the advantages of a Central European education arose to maintain its necessity. A well-known novelist saw it as one of the evils of the late war that our military and naval forces were, as far as government orders could insure, "denied prophylactics." But it is only of late that a large and lusty school of literature has risen to glorify the whole subject.

Far more significant, however, has been the discovery by "nice" women, in the course of their determined effort to get acquainted with the world, that prostitution was frequently the accompaniment of a man's nominal pre-marital celibacy. I assure you it really was a discovery.

Our sheltered mothers regarded their scarlet sisters either with

superstitious horror, or with pity as poor dumb creatures trapped in the sewers of civilization, or more practically as persons pursuing from choice a not very attractive but sometimes remarkably lucrative trade. In any case mother as a girl was fairly confident that she could have nothing in common with such creatures.

To-day the well-informed young woman is made only too well aware that what she may have in common with the professional is her own young man. She is therefore not so much concerned with her own attitude toward this sinning sister as with *his* attitude.

The old-fashioned feminine views of vampire, victim or cold-blooded trader were not, naturally, the views of the man who patronized the trade. He did come near to sharing the horror; his first inclination seems to have been to regard his partner as a sorceress luring him on by some sort of esoteric magic, though it is difficult to tell just how much of this attitude was a defense measure adopted in case of discovery. As his confidence increased he came to adopt the practical view of the prostitute as a public servant, but it still seems difficult for him to see her without glamour.

So sensitive men, one at last concludes, have come to sentimentalize over ladies who are not ladies because of the sense of incommensurable obligation we all feel to those who minister to our poor weak bodies.

It is true that in the hands of any servant we are for the moment children again, with the child's sense of gratitude to those who supply its wants. It is this sense of obligation, in a way a desire to apologize for the demands of these tiresome bodies, that makes us tip those who do physical things for us—waiters and porters and chambermaids and stateroom stewards. And is not lyric or dramatic appreciation of the light lady a similar *pourboire*, or shall we say a guest-book testimonial?

In different degrees this sort of gratitude affects every one. Surely you have noticed how the best of women are apt to grow sentimentally interested in their doctors? It's partly of course

ARE PROSTITUTES PEOPLE?

the age-old "natural law" that the sense of touch, more than any other sense, exerts physical attraction—a law politely referred to as propinquity. Unquestionably we all feel an impulse to cling like limpets to any kind hand, even if outstretched as part of the day's work.

The same physical law may strengthen marriage ties where there is no real compatibility.

The mental effect of physical intimacy would be even more dangerous except that when recognized it destroys itself. The sense of apologetic gratitude, the obligation incurred because we are all common clay, is not wholly comfortable to the human ego.

In the back of our minds persists the idea that we are *not* common clay; that this flesh which is as grass is not all of us, and that it might be better if we could only forget about our troublesome bodies altogether. We betray this feeling in sundry odd ways: by our modesty, indicating a wish to cover up the source of annoyance, and most of all, perhaps, by our instinctive tendency to despise entire preoccupation with material life. All the rationalist arguments can not keep us from a snobbish attitude toward those occupations which are concerned with bodies merely as bodies; medicine and surgery have come to be accepted because they entail mental preparation, but leech is still a term of opprobrium surviving from the days when doctors were classed with barbers.

The prostitute can hardly hope to escape her share of this disgust, which at times operates against wives and even against mothers who have been our nurses. The mind refuses to lie for ever in its physical shell; suddenly we snap out of it all, say, "But I'm not just a body!" and immediately begin to detest the person who, having served that body, must identify us with it.

Of course this is not a fair feeling, any more than the prior impulse of sentimental gratitude is fair. The fact is that people who serve us physically may do so with perfect impersonality, regarding us merely as one more mouth to feed, another pair of boots to polish. This attitude, while insulting to our egotism,

is not so bad for us as if they regarded us more particularly as that man with the false teeth and the bunion. Or, if they actually happen to love us, they may see straight through the false teeth and the bunion with the clairvoyance of affection, and cherish our bodily shells because they house our somehow precious souls. In the latter case their ability to serve us is not a proof of pre-occupation with the physical but of complete disregard of physical imperfections.

But, returning to those ladies who, hard worked as they have always been, have had thrust upon them of late the additional task of playing heroines in novels and dramatic offerings—it may be that through the simplicity of their approach to life they do register more human understanding than many nicer women do, simply because the barriers put up to preserve niceness have also served to bar out a great deal of humanity.

Let us hope so. Let us hope that there will be some gain at least in abolition of the barriers; for the fact can no longer be concealed that in many places the barriers are down. Perhaps lyric and dramatic and even more material appreciation of the painted lady went too far; for now you surely must have observed that she has her non-professional imitators. These amateurs—in every sense of the word—are numerous enough to prove that the nominal type of celibacy is no longer a game for men alone. And if you are half as curious about feminine behavior in this respect as women are about yours, listen and you will hear just how this change came about.

THE girl who was taught the feminine formula of sugar and spice and all things nice, who read sentimental novels and molded her ideas of life upon them, was bound to identify love with kisses and kisses with wedding-bells. The three blended indissolubly together in her rosy visions of romance. Her lover was encouraged by literature of the testimonial type to hope

for romance in ante- or extra-marital affairs as well as in the legal arrangement, but marriage was the girl's one chance.

Naturally she was serious about it. Taught to keep her lips pure until she met the One Man, she was likely to mistake the physical thrill of a first kiss for the thrill of a life-time affinity. If all went well she never learned any better.

At least one serious masculine observer has expressed a philosophical preference for this feminine identification of physical and spiritual love on the grounds that it makes for harmony and happiness.* But too often, in real life, such identification attracts fears and torments of a poignancy directly proportioned to individual sensitiveness to imperfection. The idealist who sees a spiritual ideal clothed with human flesh is apt to be jealously possessive. If the ideal develops human frailty a whole life's view-point must be readjusted.

Many things happened to disturb the innocent feminine trust in physical affinity. Sometimes the nice girl's deadly seriousness frightened the man away. Perhaps her innocent excitement made her cling to the wrong man. Perhaps she got safely married only to discover that there wasn't much compatibility between minds so differently trained.

Even the discovery that one's physical affinity had not kept *his* lips pure could mean something of a shock.

You probably did not escape such disillusionment in your own extreme youth. To the young of both sexes it seems as if there must be physical as well as mental affinity, for only in this way is the youthful idealist able to accept the idea of physical intercourse.

Women old enough to know better clung to the idea of physical affinity because it enhanced the importance of what was regarded as woman's chief function by making that function a monopoly. Men emancipated themselves more quickly because the acknowledgment that attraction was general made man's job more important by subordinating love to a career.

*Emil Lückä: *Eros: The Development of the Sex Relation through the Ages.*

All this is the past history touched on earlier in mentioning the surface changes. Women were slow but they learned, at length, by observation. For the affinity idea depended altogether upon the former system of comparative monogamy which was supported by polite concealment; affinities in large numbers become increasingly difficult to swallow. Now that every girl thinks automatically of Reno when she hears that line in the Bedouin love-song "till the leaves of the judgment book unfold," it requires quite a bit of self-hypnosis or else a remarkably firm faith in Providence to start confidently out upon marriage as the lifelong result of kisses or even of wedding-bells.

Of course there have always been girls who were not so sweetly ignorant as the novel-fed young lady I described. A girl attractive enough from childhood to be the recipient of many attentions learned early that the pleasures of physical contact might be general, and so shared the masculine attitude naturally. If she exhibited a mild appreciation of caresses her popularity was assured; men found in her an understanding point of view and a similar taste for the game of love, and knew her to be a safer playmate than the self-conscious prig. The prig's revenge might be to call the flirt "fast," but there was no denying the fact that the latter seemed to have a better time—this even when masculine conservatism kept her for a playmate and married the prig.

In the old days the flirt was at least kept within certain boundaries by plain fear of physical consequences. Now, encouraged by comparative financial liberty and the dissemination of knowledge which remits the penalty of "nine months' hard labor and tried for your life at the end," almost as many brave souls in life as in fiction are frankly adopting the masculine view of sex as a diversion.

Some of the pioneers had rather a hard time of it; a few who were first to go in gallantly for what is sometimes called glamorous incident ended in sanitariums through sheer ineptitude, and others discovered that to go at things in a man's way

was often to fail to attract the man. His own peculiar idea of romance was spoiled, and moreover, the old-fashioned man was hurt in his ideals. You see at once how it would be with him.

But the real question now is how is it going to be with you? Are you broad-minded enough to accept in a wife the variegated previous experience which women have so often accepted in men?

Being an intelligent man you can not very well fall back on that theory which we discarded in the beginning, that women are naturally better than men. We agreed then that women had the advantage of training in self-control, but that is an advantage which can be gained or lost in a generation.

Nowadays the fact that women feel physical attraction quite as strongly as men is so generally accepted that we have plays with the theme of feminine misconduct based upon physical necessity exactly as they used to be based on similar masculine indulgence. In one such play seen recently in New York the action turned on the pitiable situation of a young wife whose aviator husband was permanently disabled. Naturally then, as the playwright saw it, she turned for comfort to her brother-in-law, and so her husband must be murdered by his mother in order to save him the shock of disillusionment.

The really significant thing is that no one dared to protest that while adultery in such circumstances was excusable in a man it was unthinkable in a woman. In *The Sacred Flame* the final shreds of the double standard were cremated.

And there have been claims that the old values are being reversed. Dr. G. V. Hamilton's *A Research in Marriage* records a detailed examination of the lives of a hundred men and a hundred women. Arranging his statistics by ages, Doctor Hamilton found that 80% of the men in the age-group born in 1880 or before that date admitted illicit experience, while only 51.22% of those in the youngest group were so classified. Among the women, on the other hand, a steady increase in virtue was noticeable until the 1890 group; that is, those confessing illicit experience dropped from 45.45% for those born during or before 1880

to only 24% in the 1890 group; but of the women born after 1890, 60% admitted such experience. Observe that this percentage corresponds to 51.22% among the men; that is, among Doctor Hamilton's subjects the modern girl proved more immoral than the modern young man.

Whether the standard eventually prevailing is to be feminine self-control or masculine carelessness (using these terms in their old significance) depends, I believe, upon you. Women are, with all their cleverness and determination, novices at the game of sex-for-fun. It has been your game for a long time and you know it best. You can, if you like, call it a draw and quit, but you can not now keep women from playing as long as you do.

For a while you will have the advantage, but not permanently. The present situation may seem made to order for any young man willing to take advantage of it. Such an enterprising young man may, if he likes, have his usual freedom before marriage at less than the former cost—that is, instead of paying a mistress he can enter into free and friendly relations with a girl who expects no remuneration. Let us call her Number One. Later, when he is ready to marry, he can find another girl—Number Two—who is quite nice herself and old-fashioned enough to accept him with no questions asked. If she's as dumb as that he may even continue to do as he pleases after marriage.

But you, as an intelligent young man, perceive that this sort of thing can't go on indefinitely without completing a circle. Suppose that instead of the young man who marries the old-fashioned girl you are the young man who, eventually, marries Number One. In *her* life you will be Number Two.

You may ^{say now, glow} not mind this, but I suspect that you will not really like it. Let us see if you can find an intelligent ground for your objection.

YOU can not, of course, intelligently object to a girl's enjoying liberties which you enjoy. You can not carry a sense of property rights into the past; indeed, as an intelligent man, you have no sense of property rights in any other human being. You can not object to a physical act which has no results.

But has the physical act no results?

We may safely assume that it has no physical results nowadays among well-informed and careful people. But no one has yet been able to devise a conscious physical act guaranteed to be without mental or spiritual results. Are not these what you actually dread?

If a girl were hypnotized while a villain "worked his will with her" you could hardly blame her when she returned to consciousness with no memory of the occurrence. This indicates that the intelligent objection to previous experience is a question of memory. But memory is part of us all, and the more keenly you regret a memory the greater is its reality, unless you have learned complete mental self-control.

To be sure, the experienced young lady may have no regrets, and memories as memories may not trouble her. But, pleasant or not, the fact remains that memory blunts the edge of experience. Let us recall for a moment discussion of the theory of complements, in the course of which we said that companionship implied equality and similarity. Applying this to experience, there can be neither equality nor similarity when two persons do together what one has already done; the experienced person, by the inescapable fact of having been there before, must in a sense lead and so must be alone.

This, I think, explains what seems an otherwise unreasonable jealousy of previous experience. The lover or the lady with a past can not, if memory is clear, avoid comparisons, and though they may be all in favor of the present experience their very

existence is a detraction, a claim against the present. Confession is the only way to equalize matters, but confession too often places the hearer in the position of the host who discovers that his guests have seen the play; though the other company may have been inferior, still this performance loses by not being the première.

As for the theory that rehearsal is necessary, a physician whose general view-point can not be called puritanical writes: "The part which the male plays in sexual relation is so positive that he never needs instruction. . . . I have made it a professional duty to ask and have found that, indeed, the great majority of men in this group [of the experienced] seek to forget their previous experience and to avoid anything which might remind them of it."* For my part I doubt also that women need instruction.

The question then simply resolves itself into whether experience is worth its price in remembrance. In this connection there is an interesting passage in Plato's *Symposium*, in which Alcibiades accounts for Socrates' resistance to physical temptation as "a dread to have a recollection."† Socrates was an intelligent man; it does not seem impossible for intelligent men and women to understand his dread.

For those who prefer the psychological to the philosophical approach, it may be interesting to consider that the traumatic effects of experiences which the psychoanalysts consider so serious for children may perhaps be serious for adults who have not reached mental imperviousness. But it is difficult to describe the adult mind as impervious to experience without defining it also as static, not to say stupid. If one is able to undergo miscellaneous sexual experiences without effect, does not this perhaps argue a certain lack of sensitiveness in the mind?

We have now arrived, or so it seems to me, at a legitimate and more or less intelligent objection to untrammelled sexual

*Victor Pedersen, M. D., in *The Woman a Man Marries*.

†From the literal translation of George Burges. Freer readings are less significant.

AMATEUR STANDING

intercourse—an objection entitled to consideration because it is based not on physical but on mental considerations. Moreover, being mental instead of physical, it is an objection which works both ways—it is quite without sexual limitation, and could never lead us to the imposition of another double standard.

Before we think of setting up any more standards at all let us conclude our survey of the courses of action open to us. Our immediate concern is to see if there is any choice between the various forms of illegal intercourse—professional prostitution which we have discussed, amateur or friendly prostitution which we have mentioned, and a third form of prostitution which is newer still; all of which we have noted as accompaniments to nominal as distinguished from genuine celibacy.

39

AMATEUR STANDING

IT is interesting to try to determine whether old-fashioned institutionalized prostitution was worse or better than modern free relations between friends. Morally, no doubt, prostitution was worse. The patron of a “sporting house” lent his support to organized vice, which was accused of preying upon the innocent, and if it was difficult to see in the hardened professional any indication of innocent maidenhood profaned, it seems true enough that the commercial prostitute was hardly likely to be a girl of sufficient mental endowments or advantages to make her capable of independent action. If ignorance and innocence have anything in common she was, conceivably, exploited.

Not so the blithe co-ed who breaks the tedium of biology and chemistry with personal experiment, or the cock-sure business girl who calculates that she’s earned some fun and might as well take it. The man in such cases is a partner in a friendly exchange, not a buyer of doubtful goods.

Sentiment tells us, it is true, that if a thing is bad it is worse between friends. To the wrong itself is added treachery when we inflict it upon those for whom we profess affection. This,

however, is distinctly unchristian, and indeed all philosophies and religions and codes of ethics instruct us that our treatment of friends and strangers should be alike generous.

On the other hand sentiment, always weak in its logic, may suggest that love is the best excuse for intercourse, and love in an affair is always to be preferred to mere physical desire. But remember we are not talking of genuine love, that consideration for another's welfare that might conceivably forbid the sexual relation entirely; we are talking of what must be the selfish variety of love which we earlier decided was counterfeit.

And here enters another arbiter whose decisions are of value to the intelligent mind. Taste informs us that counterfeits are to be despised; that the nearer the resemblance to the original the more miserable the result. Good taste prefers a crude symbol to a finished imitation, and so, both commercial and friendly prostitution being considered as imitations of a more satisfactory and more permanent relation, good taste must give a slight preference to the former as bearing a less offensive resemblance to the original. Translating this theory into terms of experience, when you have had illicit sex relations whose ill results must consist in violation of your own mind and memory, the damage is more easily glossed over if the partner to your shame was a nameless stranger seen for an hour than if she was dear So-and-So met the next day for tea.

Indeed with men taught that physical desire and necessity were one, with women ignorant but tolerant, and with little opportunity for genuine love to create a preference for itself, the old-fashioned commercial immorality becomes understandable and almost forgivable. No doubt good men loyally minimized almost to the vanishing point any similarity between secret physical indulgence and the sacred marital relations which founded the Family. "Hat-rack" was merely a handy piece of furniture, sleeping with a light o' love like sleeping with a pillow. The old-fashioned man was enabled and even encouraged not to let his right hand know what his left hand did, as witness this counsel of an earlier guide-book:

THE WRONG TRACK

"When a man marries, all acquaintance with his former companions ceases; and unless it is renewed by sending them the cards of the newly married couple, they are no longer on visiting terms: the propriety of this arrangement is so obvious that it is unnecessary to dilate upon the subject. . . . Sound discretion will immediately suggest that many of the bachelor's most agreeable companions would be very improper connexions for a benedict, and by no means prudent associates of the domestic hearth. Custom has therefore established this rubicon, beyond which the uninvited may not pass, and has dictated that no offense shall be taken by those who have not the passport. A very wise and very convenient regulation."*

Thus encouraged it was perhaps possible to misbehave with cherubic innocence. But now we are so far from innocence that not only have we to consider the two forms of prostitution between men and women, but a third form which is different and to some minds much worse.

40

THE WRONG TRACK

PERVERSION is to the philosopher hardly distinguishable from ordinary prostitution, both being physical indulgence without legitimate excuse or compensation.

Obviously it resembles the modern friendly form of sex intercourse rather than the old-fashioned institutional prostitution, since it has not in this age been extensively organized or commercialized. It does not, however, partake of that large offense of taste, close imitation of the genuine, and so by some fastidious minds may even be preferred to the "normal" offense of illicit heterosexuality.

Perversion, however, may be classed as a graver error on the grounds that nowadays it seems generally to flourish among the so-called "intellectuals," whose sin is greater than the sins of those less fortunate because of their opportunity to know and do better. The pervert able to support his course with quotations from

*From *True Politeness for Gentlemen*, published in London about 1810.

the classics is more culpable, naturally, than the lustful man in the street who approaches a woman with the intelligence, the instincts and therefore the innocence of the cat in the alley.

I spoke carelessly of perversion as a new form of prostitution; it is in fact a very old form lately revived. Any bright child in a library containing the works of Plato, Plutarch, Moses and Saint Paul can learn enough about it; perhaps, if really bright, enough to let it alone.

I am, of course, considering psychic, not physiological perversion. Cases of the latter are so rare as to be classed with other accidents of nature which only occur often enough to remind us of the fallibility of human creators.

Psychic perversion is extremely interesting as a symptom of social change. Physiologists point to a period of homosexuality in pre-adolescence, which is of course explainable from a mental standpoint by the fact that in the new and difficult experiment of social intercourse the young person finds it easier to associate with those like himself, with whom there are no troublesome taboos. In a world made suddenly uncomfortable by social stock-taking the inexperienced find it easier to stand with those of the same sex, and so we have the explanation in this transition age not only of perversion but of women's clubs, lodges, Rotary, finishing and prep schools and similar exemplifications of sex solidarity corresponding to the monastic foundations of an earlier age of change.

Moreover, psychic perversion may have for us the value that any aberration has for the student of the human mind. We see in such aberrations our human errors so magnified as to be distinguishable from their normal surroundings, and thus we arrive through clinical study at conclusions which elude us when we look only at the normal mind and are prejudiced by its resemblance to our own.

Perversion is literally simply a misdirection, and misdirection may occur in many ways. Suppose that from babyhood a girl was taught that instead of some day falling in love with a man, she would meet another girl destined to mean more to her than all the

rest of the world. Suppose that in childhood she was teased about her girl friends, taught to value tokens of their affection as proofs of social success. Suppose that in the impressionable teens she read volumes of fiction tending to deepen this sense of the importance in her life of another girl's love. Is there any one who will venture the claim that such a training would not likely result in turning the usual schoolgirl "crush" into a grand passion?

Perversion as it exists is hardly the result of any such training, its usual explanation being not excessive interest in the same but distrust of the opposite sex. However, the description of training by which I have chosen to illustrate an approach to perversion applies with one change to the training commonly received; a girl is not taught all these romantic things about another girl, she is taught them about a man. Thus, it is not unreasonable to suppose, schoolgirl crushes are encouraged if only their object is of the opposite sex. But if perversion is misdirection are not all such mistaken loves a form of perversion?

Finally, considering perversion simply as one form of sex indulgence without the excuse of creative necessity, there may be significance for us in the fact that most people to-day regard perversion as unnatural and horrible. For it was not always so regarded except by the moral philosophers, and this discovery of change in human view-point has the implications of evolution in geologic history. The moralist may infer, if he likes, that relationships now accepted as calmly as was physical attraction between young men in Plato's time may some time receive the general disfavor accorded perversion to-day.

Plato's own proposal to outlaw doubtful loves was based on the fact that in his day consanguineous intercourse had already been outlawed. He concluded that the strongest bulwark of morality was simple declaration, leading to inner conviction, that certain acts were "unholy and infamous," and this must be untrue only in those times of uncertainty when people develop a childish, that is a perverse, hankering for the unholy and infamous as such.

The worst damage chargeable to perversion is surely its part in increasing sex consciousness. Not only do those who accept it stay in their own sex group, but horror of it encourages others to emphasize sexual traits as proofs of their own normalcy. The popular theory of perversion seems to comprehend and fear only the intermediate type, and to overlook the type of pervert that might be called super-sexed. If we sacrifice growth toward individual completeness to the boggy of the "intermediate" we may have to endure a few more evolutionary cycles to regain lost ground.

A more sensible view of the whole problem seems rather to be that the mentally intermediate type, if able to keep clear of preoccupation with sex, should in a sane world produce not pariahs but self-respecting celibates to be considered along with other genuine celibates in another chapter. If, referring to the comparison of sex with hearing, they happen to be tone-deaf there may be, as is often claimed, a compensation in better eyesight.

The oversexed pervert, on the other hand, is exactly like other oversexed persons—at worst a menace to society, at best a little queer. It is for people of this sort, whether their desires are considered normal or not, that society must construct not only psychopathic wards but artificial backbones of morality. So it was that after recommending inner conviction as the best moral safeguard Plato ended by making another proposal, "a second legal standard of honorable and dishonorable, involving a second notion of right";* namely, that modesty be invoked as an aid in the control of love, and pleasure be confined by custom. And here, with the substitution of legal custom for inner conviction, we have come to an end of our discussion of extra-legal affairs. Let us next look at the customary and legal sequel to, or substitute for, nominal celibacy: practical marriage.

**Laws*, VIII. Jowett's translation, vol. 5, p. 223.

I HAVE mentioned what I considered two general divisions of marriage into practical and romantic types but I do not wish to impose these divisions upon you arbitrarily. Let us see what the church has to say; for whatever the origin of marriage as we have it most of us permit the church to put in a word at its celebration.

We find in the English prayer-book that Matrimony was ordained for three causes:

“First, It was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy name.

“Secondly, It was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ’s body.

“Thirdly, It was ordained for the mutual society, help and comfort that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.”

These three provisions seem nicely calculated to fulfil the various ends of religion itself, of science and of romance. Religion is concerned with saving us from sin; science is concerned with the mechanism of life, and romance is concerned with mutual society. But looked at another way I think you will see that the first two provisions—for children and for the comfortable avoidance of sin—are distinctly practical, we might say physical ends; while the third is not only practical but distinctly romantic in its implications. Moreover, the three provisions are not interdependent; they may even prove mutually exclusive.

And so, if we now consider that double classification which I first proposed:

Marriage as a physical relationship for procreation and sex-gratification; or, more politely, for comfortable living; to be con-

tracted, for best results, between people attractive to each other, but presumably capable of success with several different persons:

and second:

Marriage as an association of two individuals appointed to be so associated for their mutual completeness and permanent happiness, these ends not to be achieved by either in any other relationship,

it becomes apparent that we must class the prayer-book's first two reasons for matrimony with the first or practical marriage, and the third reason with the second or romantic marriage. For we know that all sorts of people may have children, and the children may turn out very well. There are also many people who wish marriage for the second reason, and "such persons" are not necessarily complementary. But when we talk of the companionship "that *the* one ought to have of *the* other" we are limiting the field; we are imposing at once difficult and romantic qualifications.

Let us take the practical considerations first, and let us confine ourselves to the two ends mentioned by the church. I think that without undue ecclesiastical bias we may admit that the prayer-book summary is adequate; there seem to be no very important motives besides those mentioned. There are of course successful marriages in which both partners have subordinated their sexual and parental interests to other interests, usually financial or social. But we hardly need call these representative of the system, and I prefer not to discuss them here. Many people go abroad on business or for the sake of bragging to the neighbors about the trip, but guide-books are not ordinarily compiled for the benefit of such travelers, and I think I may be excused from considering marital problems of a similar nature.

There is also a marriage of mutual interest in one of the persons concerned, a give-and-take affair in which one party to the arrangement does all the giving and the other all the taking. We have all seen the abiding affection which a successful man

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST

and his adoring wife may both bestow upon him, or conversely the faithfulness with which a beautiful woman and her devoted husband may cherish her beauty. But this again we may, I hope, consider an exception.

Let us begin with the church's first object.

42

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST

THE young man who embarks on matrimony for the sake of a family can feel sure that he has the weight of public opinion and tradition well behind him. But in these days it is necessary to warn him that he should early ascertain whether or not he has the cooperation of his active partner in the enterprise.

Not long ago a leading woman's magazine published an article which a well-known psychologist began with the remark that women were unconscious beings. He then proceeded to explain along the usual line that they were ruled by their emotions because their primary, secondary and tertiary interests were race perpetuation. The editors who published the article to stir up controversy found that comments were divisible into classes according to age. Those who complacently accepted the emotional characterization as a compliment were matronly ladies who looked back over their lives and were pathetically glad to be told that they had performed the greatest of all services in reproducing themselves. The indignant protests were from young and intelligent women who very consciously objected, as one put it, to being regarded as incubators.

Physiology has furnished unintelligent folk of both sexes a temptingly easy explanation of women as females, by attributing to their physical construction all mental kinks which seem mysterious and "feminine." And the explanation has proved immensely popular with novelists and playwrights (always excepting my grandfather), who are devoting themselves these days to the sensations of ladies about to have children, ladies who

want children, and ladies who are fractious or happy, moral or immoral, selfish or self-sacrificing as they are moved by the eternal mother complex.

I trust you do not take these gentlemen too seriously.

Some women want to be mothers as some men want to be soldiers. But the percentage of each is diminishing with truly remarkable rapidity, and among members of the younger generation both types are now quite rare. Considering that motherhood was for centuries the only profession offered the young girl aside from perpetual aunthood or conventual life, the maternally ambitious seem remarkably few and far between.

Fond elders give little girls dolls in order to watch them play at motherhood and say, "How sweet." Moved by these expectations, they may actually cuddle the dollies in pretty practise for a maternal career, though the chances are they would cuddle a puppy with twice the enthusiasm, presumably with an instinctive preference for becoming dog-fanciers. But if they are bright little girls and dolls are forced upon them, they are more apt to play at housekeeping after a realistic fashion which shows a talent for the dramatic or at least the repertorial, or they will construct dolls' clothes and furniture with a skill which indicates a flair for the arts.

Even the little girl who at twelve says she's going to have a dozen children when she grows up—actuated of course by a determination to treat them much more reasonably than she is treated, and show her parents what's really proper—has little more to say about that ambition when she reaches the teens. Men may believe that this is merely modesty, but it is my duty to tell you that modesty is not all. Most intelligent girls, I am convinced, go through a period of sincere revulsion against their biologic functions at the time when these functions become troublesome. Anybody would.

Consider their situation, as an intelligent man. Would you care to be physically handicapped for at least a sixth of your time for the twenty-five years which at fifteen seems a lifetime—all

WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST

for the sake of a problematic future contribution to the race? The contribution is uncertain, depending on marriage, but the present disagreeableness is unquestionable.

"Most women," reads a familiar advertisement, "spend virtually one-sixth of their time in a state of embarrassment, fear and lack of poise." The panacea urged by the advertisement is a surgical bandage. Even when pain is quite out of the question "embarrassment, fear and lack of poise" are not comfortable; indeed it is usually the healthiest girls who most resent interruption of their activities.

Of course there is always plenty of public sympathy and poetic effusion about the more spectacular phases of the difficulty. As romantic women who visualize war always see it as a charge with bayonets, overlooking the days of standing in the mud, so the more interesting events of biological duty are those which receive attention. That crises are not always the worst, however, may be illustrated by the remark of a young mother who once inquired, "Is that all?"

"Well," said the sympathetic doctor, "isn't that enough?"

"But," she said, puzzled, "I've felt worse lots of times before." When, probably, she was teaching school, cooking a meal or hanging on a strap in a crowded street-car.

Almost any intelligent woman, if she were God for only a moment, could invent a much less clumsy way of managing the universe, and it seems to require a poor opinion of Him to think He couldn't.

Of course men have to work. Adam's curse is quite as cruel as Eve's, but it doesn't always introduce itself so early, nor is the sentence fixed. It may prove a longer sentence, yet the boy who has to go to work at sixteen can at least tell himself that he may be a millionaire at thirty. But the girl who begins at that age to set down on the calendar the dates when she won't be at her best can't be hopeful of an early reprieve except by the greater discomfort of pregnancy.

I do not wish to emphasize the periodic curse—far from it.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

My wish is that we all should be able to forget it. I favor work for women as a means to this forgetfulness, believing that we outgrow physical handicaps in the proportion that we refuse to give in to them. It is not without significance perhaps that the war which saw women put their shoulders literally to the wheel in factories and farm labor and ambulance units also developed for them clothes and customs which alleviate to some extent their physical handicap. We have had, heaven knows, enough of smelling-salts and headaches and chaises-longues in the world. Accompanying psychological wear and tear was always controllable, as every woman knows; hysteria has been a convenient weapon, never a necessity. The fact is that degrees of periodicity have been observed in men, and it has been explained as a vestigial handicap for both sexes surviving from a stage of organic life affected by the tides.

I merely remind you of these things in explanation of that lack of enthusiasm for biological duties which you may have failed to observe in women, or which they may have prudently concealed, but which can hardly be hidden much longer in view of the sales of widely advertised germicides and the decline of parenthood among the sort of people you know. For the distaste I have mentioned operates, it may be necessary to explain, against parenthood more often than against marriage. From infancy a girl knows something about marriage and is taught to look forward to it as her happy ending; its penalties do not come as a shock in the sensitive teens.

Thus introduced to maternal duty an intelligent girl may look at it in two ways. She may be, and usually is at first, disgusted with the whole procedure. Later she may become reconciled at least to the point of believing that it's silly to have all that trouble for nothing, and having the handicap she may as well use it for all it's worth. In the latter case she may come eventually to desire children.

My point of view is that this desire is hardly arrived at by the time she is credited with it by her friends the novelists.

Rarely, I believe, between the ages of fourteen and thirty is there any but the most polite and superficial interest in children among childless women. At thirty women begin to wonder if they are missing something and to clutch at "experience," but seldom before.

Of course there are always girls who coo charmingly over babies, but I am talking about what they really want. So often when they coo they want not a baby but a man.

Men, I suppose, show their innate decency and modesty in the assumption that women who pursue them are moved by maternal ambition rather than by a mere selfish desire to be petted and cared for and caressed. It's a pity to explode the theory, and only a traitor to her sex would do it. But I hope you will make the most of this treason next time you write a book or a play, and not excuse your heroine for being greedy because, poor dear, she wants a father for her child.

Far from a desire for motherhood proving an influence, the very rebellion against her physical handicap which I have tried to indicate may drive a woman toward matrimony. The handicap operates as nature plans, though in an opposite way. Tired and irritated at it, a woman may lean on a man as a protector from the universe whose laws oppress her, seeing in his individual consideration for her not treacherous operation of the same laws but an exception to them.

With no wish to make the case out any worse than it is, and without saying that women in general have a distaste for maternity any stronger than masculine distaste for work, it may, I think, be concluded that by intelligent women the whole performance is regarded as a job, not as a supreme delight. Their view of motherhood is that it is on the whole pleasant in spots and unpleasant in spots just as your work is, and that it is no more a major motivation in life, impelling every other wish and thought, than work is with you. It is, in short, exactly as sensible to talk about the mother spirit in woman as it is to talk about the labor spirit in you.

Considered as a job there are, of course, many worse jobs than motherhood, and for women it has the advantage of being a monopoly. It is a job that is usually fairly easy to obtain, if you are not too critical of your associates in the enterprise; it is still, in a majority of cases, permanent; it is considered highly honorable, and finally it is the job for which most girls still receive the earliest training.

Whatever its drawbacks any woman must admit that they are probably no greater than those attached to earning a living in the workaday world. I myself, I am sure, could look forward with more resignation to a lifetime as a housekeeper and mother of half a dozen children than to a life sentence such as most men serve in the treadmill of an office or a store. Perhaps I feel this way because I have tried working in offices and stores though I have not, as yet, tried being the mother of six. But I am inclined to think it is because the job of housekeeper and mother seems to offer almost breath-taking power and opportunities for independent judgment, originality and generally being your own boss which are open to few workers in the business world.

43

MOTHER'S DAY

ALL that the woman of intelligence asks is the right to choose her own plan of life without being subjected either to pity or to the accusation of cowardice if her choice is childlessness. You might think this a small boon, but I assure you that in a sentimental world there are people to assure her, not only that she is morally wrong, but that she is no judge of what is best for her own happiness.

You may have noticed that so far I have quoted only masculine authorities, with the hope of keeping this from being a feminist book. But on this point of their own feelings and preferences I do believe women are the best judges. I have before me two quotations on women and motherhood, one from

MOTHER'S DAY

a woman and one from a man. I shall let them speak for themselves.

He says:

"There's many a little woman will be famous by and by,
Though now her tasks are many and she often stops to sigh; . . .
Her life seems bare and ugly, but behind it there's a plan,
And the world will some day hail her as the mother of a man.

"Pass her by, you childless women, in your jewels and your furs!
Now you revel in life's glory, and a dismal lot is hers. . . .
But her name the world will honor, though she live or though
she die,
As a great man's noble mother she'll be famous by and by."*

She says:

"These women who venture here and there to try something a little different are true adventurers and not to be despised because they have not 'trekked or voyaged' farther. . . . Yet they are not great adventurers, they are but crawling forward, going over the ground some other woman has covered and adding perhaps a few inches of their own endeavor. They cannot be great adventurers until they have freed themselves from the strongest bond which holds them to the conventional ways; they cannot adventure forth to fashion empires nor to dismember them until they have cut the umbilical cord.

"So long as the obligatory child or the accidental child exists, there is not for women freedom of activity. When motherhood is recognized as a vocation to be chosen or rejected, without public censure or private blame, women can be said to have the right to choose their own vocations. Not until then will they have freedom."†

Of course as an intelligent observer you may point out that to gain freedom women only have to stop caring what the world, as represented by the popular poet first quoted, thinks about them. But whatever the dark forces that work through our physical bodies may do to hold us down to earth, they are impotent in

**Famous Women of the Future*, by Edgar Guest.

†Lorine Pruette's *Women and Leisure*.

comparison with the mental forces of vanity and convention and sentiment. To these we have even added the power of commerce. Earlier I mentioned the suspicion that Madonna worship might have originated in a conscience uneasy at having made God masculine. Whatever its origin it was no less a blessing to *moyen âge* and Renaissance artizans than was the worship of Diana to Ephesian goldsmiths, and modern business finds in Mother's Day a similar cause for rejoicing.

All this has its effect on popular opinion. Recently a woman notably successful in her line of endeavor wrote her memoirs, which included unusual experiences in both hemispheres—a lifetime of work and play and brilliant achievement. The world, or that considerable portion of it which has seen her activities, knows her ability. She has friends galore, money, position, satisfying hobbies and plenty of fun. But in a speech to an audience of publishers she said she wrote the memoirs because she got mad at an interviewer who quoted her as having said, "I have always missed the clasp of a baby's arms around my neck."

Many people would see nothing wrong with the interview. A woman's job is still seen as a sort of half-way measure, subordinate to her natural purpose in life, and as long as this holds true she can not, as Doctor Pruette observed, get very far. A double-minded woman, like a double-minded man, is unstable in all her ways; liberty, equality and maternity is a difficult if not impossible motto.

You as an intelligent man must have grown impatient with those people who are always wondering why there are more women writers of note than women who have succeeded in other lines of endeavor. It seems incredible that the answer should have to be given over and over again that writing could be done in the home, indeed in the kitchen or the nursery, while sculpture, painting or bridge-building couldn't be; also that these latter pursuits require special training, while to write it is *only* necessary to have gained some experience in living.

The fact is, of course, that even if she has only two or three

MOTHER'S DAY

children or one child instead of a dozen or so, the job is enough to put a serious crimp in any woman's career. It goes without saying that only a super-woman can have ideas and babies and a good temper all at once. And suppose the babies take only two or three or four years out of her life? Those years are taken at a time when careers are believed to be made or marred. It is exactly the same handicap that was forced upon young men who went to war.

An intelligent woman who loves you may welcome your children because they are yours, but she will realize that the job of being a mother may interfere, not only with her independent career, but with the job of being your wife. As your companion she must consider your interests; as the children's mother she must consider theirs, and the interests have been known to conflict. Suppose you are called to China when Junior has the scarlet fever? Suppose your business needs every cent of spare cash the year of Daughter's *début*? Suppose you need loving sympathy to steer you past a conscienceless lady at the same time the baby requires constant care?

It is these things and the inability of the ordinary woman to be at once a devoted mother and a charming companion that has earned the ancient division of femininity into "mother" and "mistress" types, the latter being understood to cover all women who put their relations with a man before their relations with a child. Humanity has steadfastly condemned its *Aspasia*s and built monuments to its *Cornelia*s, and only modern psychology has dared to point out that a woman may worship herself in her children as well as in her own body.

Without trying to settle the moral issue, we may say at least that the intelligent woman realizes the conflict and is no longer sure of fulfilling her destiny either as an appendage to your career or as a factor in the census.

This is no more true of the modern woman than of intelligent women in every age. You probably do not think of the "angel of the Crimea" as one of those hard-boiled creatures. But even before she had found her life-work *Florence Nightingale*

wrote, on declining a proposal from a man of whom she was quite fond: "I could be satisfied to spend a life with him, combining our different powers in some great object. I could not satisfy this nature by spending a life with him in making society and arranging domestic things. . . . To be nailed to a continuation and exaggeration of my present life, without hope of another, would be intolerable to me."

It was said, you remember, that grateful men in hospitals kissed her shadow on the wall. I hope that you will at least feel no animosity in considering the sentences quoted as in the nature of handwriting on the wall, even when as an intelligent man you interpret them to mean that the "domestic things" have been weighed in feminine balances and found wanting.

Saint Paul said that women, in spite of their shortcomings, would be "saved in child bearing." The modern woman is making the promise good in a way he doubtless never intended. It is too late to convince modern Eves that their curse is in the nature of an inescapable command; they simply refuse to believe it and prove it by escaping. All of us nowadays are declining any responsibility for the sins of our parents; we are doing quite well enough we think to manage our own.

However, I have not told you that you can not find a wife who wants to be a mother; I have merely warned you that the chances are much against your finding an intelligent woman who will be wholly devoted to that end. And though for the sake of a family you may be willing to forego intelligent companionship, you have to consider whether or not you wish an unintelligent woman to be the mother of your children.

Biologically this may be sound. But how about home environment? Are you prepared to undertake the whole responsibility for child training?

The question, you see, becomes more and more perplexing. But there is another aim to practical marriage; let us see if we can find a common ground there.

LET us look next at the idea of gratification and comfort as a reason for practical marriage.

On the extreme left wing Judge Lindsey tells us at once that "Marriage, as we have it now, is plain Hell for most persons who get into it. That's flat. I defy anybody to watch the procession of wrecked lives, unhappy men and women and miserable, homeless, neglected children who pass through my court and come to any other conclusion."*

This doesn't sound very comfortable or gratifying. We might undertake hell for a really worth-while cause—women, in fact, have been known to undertake it for the first object of marriage which we just now discussed—but is it just the place you'd choose to go for comfort? At least, one thinks, the entrance might be put off as long as possible; when religion assures us that self-indulgence without marriage means hell in the next world, why should we not prefer that to marriage and hell in this?

Of course Judge Lindsey's statement sounds a little over-emphatic in its pessimism, and we may, I think, feel sure that it is. Still it's a long way from his description to comfort and gratification, and we may still have to stop short this side.

To most of us, I believe, the miracle is that most marriages produce as much happiness as they do. Long ago Saint Paul warned his readers that those who married might expect "trouble in the flesh," and this is one statement too well borne out by observation to be dismissed as mere Pauline prejudice. In discussing prostitution we saw how our feelings toward those who must identify us with our bodies necessarily vary with our own willingness to be at one with these flesh-and-blood selves. In the form of marriage we are now discussing these same uncertainties prevail, and they seem inescapable where physical attraction is the great consideration.

**The Revolt of Modern Youth.*

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

It is the ill-timed advances and withdrawals of sexual impulse which make the companionship of courtship difficult, and the material demands of marriage continue to interfere with the mutual understanding which might otherwise develop between thinking people. In such cases we find ourselves saying, "They might be very good friends if only they weren't married," and we conclude that instead of strengthening attraction physical union seems frequently to be incompatible with union of any other kind.

If one who has been a stranger voluntarily casts in his or her lot with us, shows a willingness, out of all possible alternatives, to look at us at breakfast every morning and listen every night to our account of the day's doings—why, what a high compliment is here! But an agreement to live together physically may imply far less of real appreciation and end in an exchange of compliments of a wholly different order. If we love each other's bodies we love that part of us which is lowest, most easily duplicated or surpassed, and which can not be permanent; that part of us, in fact, which has least individuality and security. And while all bodies may be much alike, if our affections are on this level the inevitable discovery of a lovelier body must mean alienation.

Here is an obvious difference between legal and illegal unions. Alienation of affection does not in itself mean the end of marriage. But does it not mean the end of comfort and gratification?

And can you as an intelligent man tell me any good reason why you should contract to devote a life's energy to the support of a woman you marry for her physical attraction, when she can not in reason promise that she will not cease to attract?

She will do her best to keep up her end of the bargain; the commerce in Beauty—drugs, surgery, dress and all the other recognized aids to attraction—is sufficient guaranty of her ceaseless effort. Nevertheless, the young girl you marry is probably better-looking at marriage than she will be later; it is only reasonable to suppose that time must bring some diminution of her at-

traction; while your provision of a living presumably will improve as time goes on. That is, as you contribute more the wife who gives you only physical attraction must give you less. Though her charm may on the whole be well preserved it can not possibly be promised for a long lifetime, but your promise is for life.

Life sentences are imposed by some states for rape, but the woman who gives herself in marriage is in no position to claim such damage. The Mann Act, I believe, takes no account of whether the companion in interstate travel goes willingly or not, but the Mann Act imposes no such penalties as marriage sometimes imposes.

It seems fairly evident that the clear-thinking moralist will advise those whose sole reason for marriage is that they "have not the gift of continency" to seek marriage only with a clear understanding of no permanent obligation; for it is surely desirable that a condition which must be classed as infantile be not perpetuated by lifelong ties. In short, the same condition faces us here as in our discussion of the two sorts of prostitution, and we decided that the less personal relationship was preferable in that it left a lesser area of scar-tissue in the mind.

It is by this time fairly apparent how logically this form of practical marriage follows upon nominal celibacy. It is in fact removed from celibate philandering only by a ceremony, after all, so that we need hardly flinch at the term "legalized prostitution." Even ecclesiastical license is hardly a guaranty of holiness here; in our secret hearts we decline to believe that the love which is lust is really entitled to the consideration, the sanctity or the rewards that go with the sort of love the saints wrote about, just as we know better than to believe that the desire for food is sacred. Both may have the sanction of sacrament but sacrament has not succeeded in hallowing either. Why should we object then when the law dissolves marriages made on such a basis any more than we should object when the police raid a house of prostitution?

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Men on the whole have shown more intelligence than women in perceiving the flaws in marriage of this sort, which is quite natural since men pay the price exactly as women pay in the marriage for procreation. And the price is too high. Even exclusive right to live with a woman can be purchased more cheaply.

Of course you can not expect to secure physical privileges without marriage if the object of desire happens to have sufficient position to make her will law, or even if she is old-fashioned enough to cling to ceremony for the sake of conscience. Women with qualities as rare as these find it possible to hold out for the highest bid of all. But it is hard to escape the conclusion that an intelligent man can take little comfort in such a bargain.

Intelligent women at least must consider with interest the reflection attributed to a seventy-five-year-old Congressman: "I believe I would be a bachelor again if I had my life to live over. No man ever deliberately chooses marriage. . . ."

45

JUST CAUSE OR IMPEDIMENT

WE have now looked at practical marriage, ordained so that women could be mothers and men could be comfortable, and we have discovered that women no longer want motherhood and men do not find comfort in the plan. In short, practical marriage is close to being a failure in practise.

At least it is hard not to believe with the realistic novelists that the world is full of people living together mainly from habit, or from attachment not to each other but to the furniture or the bank balance; from fear of public opinion, from inertia, even from a good old-fashioned sense of duty to society, the children or the church. So Jim and his wife squabble over money. Agnes wants to work; Harry objects. Ed drinks too much. Evelyn wants to travel, while Jack is as adventurous as a turnip. . . . All of them married for one of the two practical ends and the ends have frazzled out.

The detached observer of such cases must feel the sympathy

MUTUAL HELP

felt by a traveler for the Irish goats which were turned into the fields, tied in pairs. The owner's explanation, you may remember, was that tied together they would never wander away, "for one goat will never go where the other wants to go, and so they just stay around where they are."

A certain amount of self-discipline is of course obtainable from any uncomfortable relationship, as by dogged determination you may manage to profit from a broken leg. However, we did not start out to look for education but for happiness; and most of us know better than to expect to find much happiness if we "just stay around."

After all we were told by the prayer-book that marriage was ordained by God in the time of man's innocency. Possibly that time is past.

46

MUTUAL HELP

WE have not done with the possibilities after all. To his three *K*'s for Womanhood—*Kirche*, *Kinder* and *Küche*—even the Kaiser, we are informed by his second wife, has now been persuaded to add *Kamerad*. Those of us who prefer God's authority have the third reason advanced by the prayer-book: "mutual society, help and comfort . . . both in prosperity and adversity."

Here at least, I think, we can find some hope. The most plausible theory of marriage seems to be that it will provide a best pal and severest critic safely to be counted upon for sympathy and understanding, a friend who will know all about us and love us just the same. Serious observers in these days unite in the conclusion that the real test of happy marriage is in the persistence after "the first year" not of passionate attachment but of a steady every-day affection. "Love me little love me long" is in effect the burden of their song.

It requires only an elementary ability to measure to prove that more love is required in the end if it is to be spread over a long period. Yet this necessary bread-and-butter of a permanent rela-

tionship is plainly the antithesis of sex attraction and of the possessive variety of love. Other ingredients than sex must be present, and in larger quantities.

In this necessity may lie the key to that problem so perplexing to sentimental Americans, of how it is that marriages based on property interests or social aims occasionally prove more successful than our orthodox "love" matches. Common interests of even an economic sort seem a useful tie, more permanent and hardly more to be despised than physical charm.

For companionship to endure it must have a mutual interest in some work or play wholly separated from sex. No matter how well we may wish each other we can not be congenial traveling companions if we take different trains and encounter each other only at those junctions where we spend a night.

Moreover, it seems fairly reasonable to suppose that if some companionship is good more is better; that is, the nearer perfection in marital friendship we can come, the happier we shall be. So at last we approach the complementary ideal as also the working method; and we find that the fourth consideration of the Kaiser and the third consideration of the prayer-book have brought us at last to the second or romantic form of marriage, with the conclusion that if we are to find companionship at all it must be in the marriage that stresses sex distinction least. For, as we have already noticed in discussing sex, the theory of complements implies defeat of the sex principle as commonly interpreted in terms of differences. Complements, we saw, must be essentially like and equal; moreover, recognition of a complementary personality required understanding of the individual separated from sex characteristics.

Perhaps it is not for nothing that so many romantic heroines have gone clad in men's apparel and so introduced themselves to the hero without the artificial barriers.

Certainly it was not for nothing that romantic hero and heroine have struggled together through trials and tribulations, emerged undaunted from under crushing difficulties, toiled trium-

HISTORICAL ROMANCE

phant over insuperable obstacles, gambled on a last desperate chance. Romance lies in the struggle itself. But promise of a solidly enduring companionship lies in the fact that they helped each other on the job. So romance domesticates itself, after all, as practically as the Quaker succeeds in business.

It is only the initial assumption of romance—that we may find upon earth, fate permitting and even assisting, the one companion written in the stars—that is miraculous. To say that of two complementary companions one shall be a man and the other a woman, that both shall be of suitable marriageable age, inclination and condition—aye, there's the rub. If people are to be affinities their entrances into this world must be timed with almost unbelievable accuracy, and their subsequent movements as providently guided.

But granted this, the rest is obvious. Marriage, of course, permanent marriage; for sympathetic companions do not grow on every bush, and if you find one you are quite naturally of the opinion that the sympathy should be conserved for a lifetime. As such sympathy between two persons is rare enough it is also reasonable to deduce monogamy as the means of conservation.

In this case, however, the two can not remind us of unhappy goats tied together in mutual misery, but rather of Alpine climbers roped together to dare precipices that neither could manage alone.

47

HISTORICAL ROMANCE

IN reaching these conclusions about the necessity for a mutual outlook and intention, and even employment, I am not forgetting our great-grandmothers. I know that the little lady who sits primly in the daguerreotype with great-grandfather standing beside her (or, as was the more frequent unchivalrous arrangement, standing with a mittened hand on his shoulder while he sits) is almost certain to be referred to as one who made a practical success of marriage, with no nonsense about equality or similarity. Great-grandmother was a womanly woman, great-

grandfather was a manly man, and they went after the business of wedlock as nature intended. They celebrated their golden wedding anniversary with peaceful smiles and twenty-four grandchildren. . . .

Perhaps. Often, statistics show, great-grandmother was merely the first, second or third or even the fourth of great-grandfather's wives, the others being interred long before a golden anniversary could be reached. Our forefathers had no objection to plural marriages if not concurrent.

Let us, however, waive that objection and assume that if not his only wife, great-grandmother was the one great-grandfather chose to be buried by. Even so the modern girl may tell you that she sees no reason for being any more satisfied with great-grandmother's brand of marriage than with the plumbing, lighting, clothing or transportation great-grandmother endured.

But a better answer, I think, is that our great-grandparents escaped some of our difficulties not only because they did not demand so much of each other, but because there was not so much difference, paradoxical as it may seem, in their interests. Perhaps mental companionship in the sense in which we know it was not expected in the days when women were not supposed to have minds; women were required to be charming or useful, neither of which implies being companionable. But also, as women were expected to think less, men did more thinking about household affairs than many of them do nowadays, and as their wives usually did accomplish a little cerebration on the quiet there was probably more companionship in the community interests of providing wood and water, of managing garden and barnyard, than is generally supposed.

In pioneer days the practical objects were romantic objects demanding the best efforts of both husband and wife. The mere business of living was exciting and, as we observed before, the physical results of marriage were of far more consequence. The job on which the conquerors of the wilderness could unite was the job of raising offspring, which wasn't then merely a woman's

work. Mutual interests? Look at those twelve- and sixteen- and twenty-children families! Small chance there for jealousies and infidelities and complexes. Small need for books like this about marriage. If you'd been an intelligent young man with a wildness to conquer you'd have married a good strong girl when you were eighteen or so, had a child every year thereafter, and been too busy feeding her and the children to worry about whether you were really happy with her or not. Similarly she'd have been too busy having the children to wonder if you were companionably mated, and you'd both have been faithful because there'd have been small temptation to be otherwise.

Our pioneer civilization developed this sort of partnership, but it did not endure past the pioneer stage. With civilized security came a division of interests, and when the frontiers became back-country the too intensively cultivated soil began to yield a bumper crop of marital difficulties. The pioneer wife who kept a shotgun for stray Indians had a granddaughter who, retaining merely the ability to handle firearms, turned a revolver on a straying husband. The only danger common to the younger woman and her husband was boredom.

In this question of common action I believe you will find the solution of all those back-to-nature theories which promise happiness on primitive grounds. "We useter be so happy in them days when we was pore" . . . "Come with me, my darling, to a new life in the broad sunset land where men are men" . . . these clichés contain a grain of truth as unconnected with poverty as with bracing western air. The promise of happiness is in a mutual job of keeping wolves from the door or coyotes out of the cabin.

But can we find no mutual jobs in present-day civilization?

IN recent years the marital partnerships have been found along civilization's new frontiers of scientific discovery, the arts, even modern business. And if you will look at the Darby and Joan cases nowadays (being so lucky as to know any) you will, I think, find that they are people who work together in the same or allied fields, usually at jobs which have been considered men's work. Women, that is, are working as partners in medicine or law or writing or business because men of this generation have not entered so easily into the traditional feminine job of bringing up a family.

Because they are conscious efforts to do what previously was done unconsciously if at all, these marriages of equality made possible by woman's economic independence have no real parallel in history. They are new under the sun.

It's true that our public prints have been filled with their difficulties as with the wrecks of airplanes. There are hazards to all experiments, though hardly ever the hazards foreseen by the first objectors. When women first tried to have "careers" there were plays and stories galore based on conflicts between an artist's work and her family's demands, on rivalry between two persons married to each other and competing professionally, and so on. In actual practise these conflicts seem to vanish. A woman really successful at her job earns enough to pay a substitute houseworker, and comparatively few husbands and wives seem moved to go after the same prizes. On the contrary, if the work is similar but not quite identical, as when architects and interior decorators, authors and editors, playwrights and actresses or scenic designers join forces, marriage seems almost a combination in restraint of trade.

Menaces which actually threaten the new edge of cultivation are savage survivals more troublesome than Sioux and wild animal impulses against which the modern pioneer is often more helpless than great-grandfather was against a lynx. Earlier
170

THE NEW PIONEERS

pioneers had legitimate employment for the savages and a good use for the animals, but both are out of place to-day.

To put it less obliquely, when marriage permitted a combination of romantic excitement with the practical aims of procreation, primitive emotions were relatively harmless. Feminine vanity centered logically enough in physical charm, and possessiveness was quite excusable in the mother of ten. Nor was masculine conviction that children were the only proof of wifely affection and husbandly fitness out of place in their father. But when these traits and convictions are carried over into a state of civilization which entirely separates marriage and procreation the results are unfortunate. The working wife, if she can imagine herself unappreciated, and the husband of the working wife, if he can fancy himself neglected, find themselves in a latter state worse than the first.

But it seems reasonable to suppose that these misunderstandings will vanish as the present job, whatever it is, becomes more absorbing and cooperation on it more effective. The trouble with the intellectual field is not that it is barren but that it is unexplored. In these days of no more terra incognita in the geography and no more physical mysteries in polite society we may have nothing left to penetrate except the mazes of each other's minds, but here indeed is virgin soil.

In its cultivation lies our best hope of the achievement by men of feminine and by women of masculine wisdom, and who shall say that even childless marriage is fruitless if it improves humanity? As one moralist has written in quite another connection, "We keep on repeating: More children, more children, just as in 1916 we said: More cannon, more ammunition; but the formula is too short. What society claims, what it feels to be its pressing need, is not children but men and women."*

*Paul Bureau, *Towards Moral Bankruptcy*.

THE greatest advantage in exploring another mind is the effect upon one's own. As in the physical world we progress by the expansion and contraction of our muscles in contact with the ground, so our egos expand and contract when brought into contact with forces which are in their way as important as gravity. One such force is undoubtedly romantic love with its impulse toward self-improvement.

As a practical example of what marriage can do to improve people, just look at what it has done for women.

I mentioned earlier the Oriental view that women were moral lepers. From the Old Testament it appears that far from assuming woman to be of finer clay, possessed of a divine instinct for chastity and a plain duty as the natural guardian of public righteousness, the patriarchs saw her as the weaker vessel spiritually and morally. The Oriental, with ten opportunities for gaining knowledge where the monogamous Occidental has but one, failed to discover that his women were any better than himself.

No doubt women actually were a wicked and degrading influence whenever they were so regarded. As it was only through masculine weakness that the subject woman ever got her way, she can not have tried very hard to force virtue upon her lord and master.

Then how did women reach the high moral plane they have, until quite recently, occupied among the western nations?

They reached it because they were boosted up to it by men, who began to require goodness in their wives. In the chivalrous West it happened that the Queens of Beauty were proclaimed Queens of Virtue too, and eventually the ladies obliged. Women became, if not quite perfect, at least better than they were, for the excellent reason that men would have it so. The development is so recent that it has not yet reached the churches, most of which were organized and still operate on the theory that women know

very little about goodness and should keep silence in the places where goodness is preached.

Of course this idea of progress through association may not appeal to you at all when the situation is reversed. When I point out what you have done with women you may feel alarm lest they contemplate a like improvement in you. But I hasten to assure you that the situation is not so easily reversible. From infancy women have been taught to please; they are (or were) urged to curb their egotism and consider what other people, especially men, might want. Women offer more plastic material for reform; in this generation, at least, you are fairly certain to affect them more definitely than they can hope to affect you.

You indeed, unless I misjudge your handicap, find it hard even as an intelligent man to contemplate any sort of fusion with another mind. Romance may advance as the *summum bonum* the theory of complements, and a famous psychologist may conclude that this is the final solution of the tangle,* but you have long been trained to independence and cast by tradition in the rôle of conqueror. You must have to fight the tendency to feel that equality is shameful; that your proper part is to adopt a sympathetic and appreciative little wife, instead of allying yourself with an aspirant to full partnership. You may want, in short, simply to be let alone. And it's true enough that if loneliness is your ambition you can achieve it easily, perhaps even more surely by an unequal marriage than by celibacy.

But the real advantage of marriage is not reform imposed from the outside by a stronger mind. It is development from the inside as a result of association, and is therefore to be classed as self-improvement or even as self-realization. It is education only in the true sense of bringing out something already there.

There are in each of us, as modern literature and common

*"As I look around me, I seem to find that the one thing which deepens life, which gives it 'resonance,' which brings it great joy, is the putting oneself outside oneself into another personality. It is the *identification with another personality*, and not simply bodily gratification, to which the whole sex-process seems fundamentally to point." H. A. Overstreet, *About Ourselves*.

experience have agreed, several selves which alternate in our intercourse with other people. We may not go so far as the Wellsian hero who complained that he was not a man but a mob. But we must at least agree with Saint Paul in being all things to all men—one sort of person to Bill Smith, another to Sam Jones, another to the doctor or the tailor and so on, all quite naturally and with no intention of deceit.

Among these selves there is presumably one real or "best" self which we acknowledge when we excuse some dereliction with the phrase, "I'm sorry, but I'm not myself to-day."

Then if we are truly to "express ourselves" we have the job of finding some way to keep this best self on top. It can never become a habit with us if we are continually swapping it for the Bill Smith or the Sam Jones character. A man can not, as we say, associate constantly with Tom, Dick and Harry and call his soul his own.

The theory of the celibate is that he saves this best self for himself; that he knows it best and can best bring it out by cutting himself off entirely from other intimate association and concentrating on it.

But the unbiased observer is apt to conclude that the self you see for yourself is often not your best self at all.

Coming back to practical cases, if you love a girl and are on your best behavior with her, while exhibiting to her a self which you would never dream of displaying to Bill Smith or the tailor, you are exercising this particular self and identifying it as *your* self more and more as you see more of that girl. If it is actually your best self which parades for her benefit she is not cramping but helping you to express your real personality.

JUST where, in considering marriages based on mental affinity, do we find ourselves in the matter of practical living? We have said that the chances for mental companionship in marriages based on physical attraction were slight. How about physical attraction in marriages made by the other plan?

We may take it as an axiom that unity of mind is not attainable through physical intercourse, and to attempt to gain it on that basis is equivalent to the schoolboy's attempt to absorb a knowledge of arithmetic by putting the book under his pillow. In the physical world we can not even attain unity of physical sight; stand cheek to cheek and eye to eye with your love, look at the same object, and you will see it south by east while she sees it east by south. Before you translate this physical limitation into speech you may feel perfectly confident that her view is yours, and lo, she will remark on an aspect of the case which reveals an entirely different angle.

There is even an advantage to this double vision, but it is an advantage only when unity of mind has been attained in another way.

When, however, the inward and spiritual unity does exist we are surely entitled to the comfort of physical contact with the people we love as its outward and visible sign. We have a perfect right to feel another person as near and dear to us—as near and dear, precisely, as the familiar body which we customarily inhabit and to which, despite our protestations as to its imperfections, we are as kind as possible. We may be "one flesh" as sinlessly as we live in our own skins, as long as we are not unduly excited or intoxicated by this other body any more than by our own. But if we are to be actually at one there can be no more physical thrill attached to kissing another hand than to kissing one's own, for the very existence of the thrill proves a difference. There may be romantic delight if the kiss represents something longed for and attained, but that after all is a different thing.

We regard with some condescension a human being passionately enamored of his own physique, and it is hard to see why this attitude should not extend to too glowing appreciation of any physical charm merely as such. Nor should vanity demand such exorbitant tribute. A complete unity of thought may include hospitable sharing of the bodily dwelling but it can not include making it appear more important or more dazzling than it is. And however we may lie, romantically and artistically and hopefully, about our bodies—however we may costume them and perfume them and try to pretty them up—we who live in them know them for what they are. The best we can say for them is is that they are harmless and useful shells. If we are to succeed in life we master these shells, manage them, make them obey us or as we say nowadays “express” us, and in so doing we may make them graceful and even beautiful. By turning the light of intelligence and the color of individual character on them they may come to attractive life as stage properties, well managed, will do, but even so they are not *us*. To urge upon others the acceptance of them as identical with ourselves is the basest of deceptions, being a deception about the deepest and most vital facts of life, and shall we practise it upon those we love best of all?

On the other hand an intelligent detachment is not to be confused with unnecessary disparagement or punishment of the body. Though it is a blind and treacherous leader, the body as a servant is not to be despised. Conquering the flesh means not annihilating it but compelling it to serve one's ends; the Roman civilization in which Christianity first urged this conquest made good use of the vanquished as hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Unlike the slave of Rome the disciplined flesh responds to good direction with a feeling of pleasure. And as innocent physical pleasures usually convey a power of some sort—the pleasure of swimming, power over water; that of speed, power over space—so the physical side of marriage brings a power, nor do I refer to the power of reproduction. If we relinquish that power in the interests of modern civilization, another one remains and is, in fact, strengthened.

"STILL FAIR AND KIND AND YOUNG"

This other power is the power of speech in a language less complicated than that of the tongue but more convincing. Its expression, indeed, is limited to "I love you," and its ultimate statement is held veracious only when addressed to one person.

Within these limitations it is hard to see why this language of the whole body should be less useful or less honorable than ordinary speech. "I love you" can not be said too convincingly between those who are in constant association, with—as must be if minds are to work together—constant opportunities for irritation.

I do not mean to say that marriage is one long battle, only made endurable by the truce of an embrace. But it can not be denied that the intimate association of minds is not altogether without shock and pain to the individual ego; this, I think, is why the urge to physical contact endures in the friendly handclasp as in the lover's touch. We make our bodies apologize for the wounds our minds inflict.

In a perfect state this may not be so; in heaven no doubt our minds will be revealed in such crystal clarity that assurances of good intent will be unnecessary. But our present efforts to reach heaven demand the interchange of ideas, not without blood; the worldly concept of progress depends on friction. And in the friction of minds, as I have remarked, love is the lubricant.

Thus with the shift of emphasis from physical to mental attraction we need expect no immediate revolution in our ways of living; no more immediate, that is, than the revolution we have been enjoying for some time. There have been alarmed discussions of marriage in which physical incompatibility was emphasized as a cause of divorce, and proposals for trial marriage are, of course, based on the old notion of physical affinity, since mental affinity or the reverse can be otherwise determined. But if we have the least control over our bodies—certainly if they influence our minds to the extent the biologists claim, or if they are influenced by our minds as the psychologists say—it is difficult to see how physical incompatibility could exist without mental incompatibility at least as marked.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

In an earlier consideration of physical affinity we concluded, you may remember, that belief in its importance was an error of the inexperienced feminine mind. Surely a man who sees physical attraction as a simple, general thing of no great rarity need have no fear of physical discord where mental harmony exists.

At least we must admit that our previous efforts to introduce intelligence into the physical realm have almost invariably been rewarded by increased comfort, gained, it may be, by a regimen appearing foolish and annoying to the "natural man," but still demonstrably effective. Among the exhibitions of intelligence which have already affected the physical aspects of marriage for the better should be noted a praiseworthy increase in personal fastidiousness among civilized people, and the more general recognition of individual rights to privacy. If physical considerations were all, there should have been fewer divorces in the generation that equips each dwelling with shower-baths and twin beds.

Above all, the path of romance should be easier now that men are no longer physical menaces to the women they love. This aspect of birth control may not have occurred to you but it's literally the case. Of course men are not to blame for Eve's curse, and certainly an adequately informed woman who married on the old-fashioned plan had no legitimate objection to "the almost inevitable consequences." Nevertheless, there have of course been cases of women married to brutes, or even not married to them, who suffered physical and mental tortures as a result of their physical handicap. To them men must indeed appear as menaces.

Married women, moreover, have long been barred from the really interesting activities because of physical disability; they could not join in the search for "something lost behind the ranges" because there might not be proper medical care on the other side. In this disability and consequent discontent no doubt arose the theory that intelligent women did not make good wives.

But now, just as you need not feel that you will be sought

after by intelligent women for your economic assistance, so you need not represent danger or limitation to them. The moral aspects of birth control we shall discuss later; here it is sufficient to observe that it seems essential to the peace and happiness of romantic marriage as we see it to-day.

SUPPOSING we have brought our own conduct into some relation to intelligence, what security can we feel that our happiness will not be destroyed by the stupidity of others?

It is safe to say at least that intelligence is better fitted than primitive emotion to cope with outside interference. For women, at any rate, the modern type of marriage in which a woman is a grown-up person with a job of her own seems to offer an opportunity to steer clear of the lower forms of jealousy and distrust. A woman conscious of physical weakness and financial dependence, with "s. a." her only asset, was almost inevitably a prey to jealousy. If circumstances permitted her to be idle, to think long thoughts and weave ignorant theories about the mysterious masculine world, her peace of mind could only be protected by an almost impermeable veneer of vanity. If your whole career had consisted in "holding a wife" as hers consisted in holding a husband, you'd have been jealous too.

Perhaps the changed attitude of the modern woman is simply due to a suspicion that possessiveness doesn't pay, that as a clever woman writer has phrased it you lose what you grab. But certainly the better-informed wife nowadays prefers to hold her husband by having no fear of losing him, and even permitting him to gain by friendly association with other women, rather than to have the bother of keeping him tied by the home fire.

However, if we leave the ground of practical expediency to look at the romantic requirements we are reminded that tolerance has a romantic limit. The romantic requirements, as I mentioned before, are more stern than those of religion or of philosophical

morality. In plain language, romance dissolves into the ridiculous when you come to consider affinities in the plural. The whole theory of complements implies an association so intimate that successive combinations are undesirable and impossible; for the romantic idealist any breaking off amounts to dismemberment, parting to death.

To be sure, there must be a breaking-up of mistaken alliances as a prelude to more enduring arrangements, and with this idea in mind the changing patterns of modern marriage are encouraging rather than dismaying. In one of his later books Sir Arthur Conan Doyle quotes a voice at a seance as estimating that only one in five of the marriages made on this plane survive on a higher level. In short, far from marriages as we have them being made in heaven, four out of every five of ours are annulled there. Whether you accept the estimate as authentic or as a figment of Sir Arthur's imagination you must admit that the percentage is confirmed by observation as a rather likely guess.

Clearly our divorce rate will have to go much higher if the world's marital problems are to be adjusted through redistribution. Its rise will be proof not of the reign of lust and licentiousness even now remarked upon, but of the fact that our old methods of selection are incompetent and dangerous. While outraged moralists are pointing to divorces based on physical selfishness—as that of the ungrateful husband so often mentioned, who puts away a dowdy middle-aged wife in favor of a lovely young stenographer—we can feel sure that there are other more legitimate divorces based on mental incompatibility.

But even with the handiest divorce laws those who accept physical as a substitute for mental unity necessarily ~~postpone the~~ ultimate attainment, and make trouble for themselves. In these days we may rightly enough dissolve in sympathy for all whose mistakes have drawn them into hell. We do what we can to get them out; we make divorce easy and remarriage easier still. We charitably assume that a married man's love for his stenographer may be spiritual and worthy, while his marriage was the unholy

result of animal attraction. But even though we allow him a divorce and trust that he will live happy ever after, we can not repay him for his trouble or the first wife for hers, or the second wife for the fact that she is a second wife.

A difficulty in the solution of all triangles is that if the perfect accord of the second marriage must include knowledge of mutual responsibility for the unhappiness of a third person there's a serious flaw at the start. People who have not attained sufficient understanding of ethics to be miserable when guilty of ungraceful action need hardly expect to find perfect happiness. Those who choose the path of conventional loyalty may be actuated by no ordinary conservatism but simply by the feeling that before living blissfully with another it is necessary to live respectfully with one's self. Moreover, we may gauge the actual mental quality of the new attraction by our perception of these things. Love that is securely anchored brings ~~an~~ irresistible impulse toward physical expression.

Fortunately in real life as in fiction we may assume that innocent and happy third persons in a triangle are rare. If you were miserably married the chances are almost certain that your wife would be miserable too, and your separation would be a blessing to all concerned.

But I said it was difficult not only to pay the first wife for her trouble but to pay the second wife for being a second wife. This requires us to consider another romantic requirement touched on briefly before: romance is in the *first* thing. This doctrine applied to marriage appears to require pre-marital chastity on both sides if it is to exist on either.

In short, if marriage is in itself to be the first thing it must be first with both. If the idea of beginning applies only to this marriage it should be so understood, with previous experience on both sides as equal as possible.

It requires only a little romantic imagination to understand Posdnicheff's confession: "I killed my wife . . . before I knew her . . . when I first tasted sexual joys without love." We

may see this as the exaggeration of a maniac, but if we are actually to be above Posdnicheff's view we must have acquired a distrust of the intrinsic value of "sexual joys." If we are to hold them really essential we must acknowledge that prior experience does create a gulf between the experienced and the innocent which it is difficult to bridge, at 1.

We may observe philosophically that the most innocent of us is none too innocent, the most experienced simple about some thing. We may admit that for "these twain" to be "one flesh" is no great matter after all, since all humanity is one flesh. We may reduce our objection, as we did in consideration of that experienced young lady in whose life you were hypothetically Number Two, to an objection to memory, and we may sensibly conclude that no two people, however complementary in character, can expect to share the same memories.

These, however, are philosophical and religious and common-sense considerations, and they have nothing to do with romance. It is religion, not romance, that offers eternal forgiveness—a new gift for the tarnished toy. The new gift may be even better, but it is never quite the same; applicants for another chance must come with a new knowledge of values, trying for happiness on another and a higher level, substituting for their first fine careless rapture a careful and considered trudging toward heaven.

Truly if we see as the angels we are not alarmed by human mistakes; we can not hold that any one is hopelessly soiled by material contacts, any more than a child is permanently harmed by falling in the mud. We simply brush him off and set him on his feet again. But unfortunately angelic vision comprehends not only the unreality and unimportance of one human experience but of all human experience. You can not look through one eye and perceive the futility of one effort to find happiness in material contact without perceiving through both eyes, willy-nilly, the futility of that expectation at any time. Thus you can not simultaneously be a forgiving angel and an equal and similar human complement.

OTHER PEOPLE

Perhaps we can see the thing most clearly by adopting, for a moment, the standard of good taste which you may remember we found useful once before. On this basis we may forgive any mistake as a breach of manners, but we find it hard to maintain our previous view of the culprit. You may excuse your grandfather for drinking beef tea clumsily (my grandfather of course is a vegetarian) because he is an old man grown careless; you may even see him as a comedy character and be quite resigned in the knowledge that many old men grow careless in their habits. But to the extent that he has become a comedy character he has ceased to be your grandfather; you see him now as a detached person, not as one close and dear to you. Often our casual relationships with people are improved when we do acquire this perspective; it has even been advocated as the civilized method of maintaining marriage.

But it is utterly untenable with the concept of an *alter ego*. The essence of identifying love is concern for the beloved, not a polite and basically cynical detachment.

This may be why so many modern stories of marital forgiveness fail utterly in romantic appeal. Granted, it is the Christian thing for a wronged wife to forgive her husband or a wronged husband to forgive his wife. It is often the civilized and sensible thing. But it is not romantic.

If these conditions seem hard it must be remembered that this thing we are seeking is understood to be uncommon, so rare indeed that some people doubt that it exists at all. We are not buying chewing-gum but the pearl of great price. We can not say surely where we shall find it; we only know where it is not. And one of the places where it seems least likely to be met is in the second-hand shop.

Fortunately if we are intelligent people we are not brought easily to the end of our resources, but are pricked on by defeat to further exertions. When the world of familiar things offers little there is still perhaps the undiscovered country of the mind, and we have heard rumors that even farther beyond there is a

country of the spirit. These may prove the romantic lands after all, for it is over their frontiers that happiness keeps slipping out of our earthly hands.

THE whole difficulty with the romantic plan has been carrying it out with any degree of certainty. Obviously its success depends upon our finding and recognizing and persuading the proper sharer of our destiny. It is a recipe in which catching the hare is not only the first but the most important step.

Most of us start out with the best intentions. The romantic ideal, we noticed, appeals naturally to nice young people; the affinity system as it works in fiction, from which most of us receive our earliest education in romantic love, seems delightful enough. But many of us have forced upon us before we leave the teens the discovery that this arrangement has somehow been put out of joint. Instead of attraction being mutual as it is in nice stories it's frequently not that way at all. Jane loves Tommy but Tommy loves Kate, while Kate loves Herbert; Herbert is passionately attracted by Anne who is attracted only by John, John is sure that Emily is the only girl for him but Emily likes somebody else, and so on *ad infinitum*. If we were ever meant to be proper partners somebody has played a mean trick and swapped the favors.

Bitterness over early mistakes results in general suppression in later life of our romantic wishes, and the world, assuming that this is best, makes no effort to palliate the harshness of first disillusionment. For centuries such young misery due to hit-or-miss affections has been considered necessary and even funny. Only in our own generation has there been a change of heart exhibited in plays such as *Young Woodley*, in novels such as *Alice Adams*. In the novels of Mr. Tarkington we may indeed see the whole range of attitude toward youth in love and therefore in trouble.

NATURAL SELECTION

The fact is that while the agonies of young love may be funny as mumps are funny we should not encourage the spread of either for our own sadistic amusement. As medical theories warn us that an early illness may leave lasting effects, so in that blight which almost inevitably overtakes the first tender passion it often happens that ideas of real value are ended too, and false general conclusions drawn from unhappy individual experience. Perhaps we shall learn a little more kindness and carefulness when we realize that habits of mistaken selection are not outgrown with youth; that the same ignorance which causes trouble at one-and-twenty may cause more trouble at one-and-forty.

We may blame parents, schools, churches and other educational institutions because they fail to instil in boys and girls an understanding of each other, and indeed, as we observed, bend their efforts to building artificial barriers. We may suspect that even the most modern attempts at "sex education" are not guiltless of stressing differences which should be minimized, emphasizing physical gnats while swallowing camels of erroneous concepts. Our only excuse is that if we ever so far sympathize with youth as to adopt the romantic ideal we shall have to reconstruct all our ideas of selection and concentrate new efforts on the task.

53

NATURAL SELECTION

EVEN as few as fifty years ago the requirements of two persons contracting marriage presumably differed not only from to-day's requirements but from each other's. They were, you see, the requirements for practical marriage based on sex differences.

A man wanted:

A healthy and beautiful woman to be the mother of his children.

An energetic and biddable housekeeper.

A woman wanted:

An experienced and generous provider for herself and her children.

A wise and indulgent director.

This is not to say that these wants were conscious considerations but that they were reasonable ones for those contracting an old-fashioned marriage. If they were not actually thought of, from the scheme of things they should have been, and they were fairly well taken care of by the habits and customs of courtship. That is, health and beauty being usual accompaniments, a man was fairly safe in choosing a pretty girl, and a woman, during a period in which men played the cavalier, could judge a suitor's generosity and his financial prospects by his gifts, his kindness by his thoughtful attentions.

But in these times how the demands have changed!

Of a man's demands I am not qualified to judge. But of a woman's old demands the second is to-day merely funny, and the first is at least obsolescent. Most intelligent women expect to be self-supporting in one way or another. As I told you they are not likely to feel any urge toward complicating existence with children. What they want first of all from the men they marry is that congenial companionship which we have already seen to be in accord with the romantic hope of permanence in marriage. They want somebody to talk to, somebody to talk to them and keep them from being lonesome—a playmate and a collaborator and a lifelong friend.

Assuming for even a moment that the intelligent man's wants to-day are similar, consider the difficulty we all are in when we have as guides only the antique courtship customs and qualifications suited to an entirely different marital purpose. It is exactly as if, no longer wishing to hire a ditch digger but an expert accountant, we applied to our choice of the accountant the standards evolved for the selection of a high class of ditch diggers.

As long as marriage had for its highest mission the produc-

tion of children it might well be based on physical attraction, and the attraction might well be temporary, one-sided or unsuitable. No matter. As my grandfather once observed, physical attraction is a poor basis for marriage but may produce a perfectly sound baby. Early marriages between persons too young to know the difference between physical attraction and the real thing might result in satisfactory children; unsuitable marriages between ages too far apart for real companionship—between, say, a girl in her teens and a man old enough to be her father—might do the same. An eighteenth-century diarist, a fine and upright gentleman for his time, approached another nobleman with an offer of marriage between the two houses and records the prospects thus: "He said, that of his eight daughters the eldest was between fourteen and fifteen years old; the second much deformed, and in no way marriageable; the third between twelve and thirteen years of age, and the rest were children."* Europe in that century was in no position to lecture the Orient on the subject of child marriage.

Already the circumstances of modern life have done much to revise our requirements in the direction of equality. Coeducation and changed economic habits, for example, have settled the age question fairly well. But mere circumstantial revision is evidently not enough in these days when we demand so much more than beauty in a wife, so much more than money in a husband. As long as it was only a matter of choosing "the mother of my sons," "a father for my children," we could afford a fine carelessness; let posterity pay the bill. Now we perceive a more intimate connection with our own well-being, which is in modern thought largely dependent upon our surroundings. Wives and husbands constitute our later as parents constituted our earlier environment. Unless you regard yourself as hopelessly jelled—if, that is, you expect to resist age and decay by growing instead of growing old—you can make at marriage a decision as important as choosing your own parents would have been.

*Memoirs of the Duc de St. Simon.

And while I said the requirements were changing this does not mean that the old standards do not persist, are not encouraged, are not indeed forced upon you on every hand. At the moment when you have the need of a lifetime to use your head, you are invited by a world full of sentimentalists to use your heart.

54

'AUTO-INTOXICATION

PITIFUL pleas that moral conventions are a menace to marital happiness have been fairly successful in obtaining modifications of the moral code. It has not been so often remarked that the conventions of sex attraction are far more dangerous, and more might be done for marital happiness by learning to control our emotions.

In other fields we have come, as intelligent people, to weigh emotional impulse carefully. For example, there has been of recent years a clearly defined tendency to look with suspicion upon emotion in religion. We have analyzed religious ecstasy and found its contents of doubtful value. It has not been announced that emotion in life generally is as untrustworthy, though Confucius some time ago discovered, and set down as a rule of conduct, "If a man be swayed by passion, his conduct will be wrong; and so if he be swayed by terror, by fondness, by sorrow, by distress." *What is left worth living?*

We are only now coming to make this discovery in the Anglo-Saxon world and to set it down that the man who manages his theology, his business or his private life in the heat of passion is apt to be, instead of the fine lusty fellow our forebears would have thought him, merely an overhasty moron. But we are not yet sure of the ethics of this attitude.* We still distrust somewhat

*It may be interesting to consider that even emotion in religion, carried to its ultimate excess, has its apologists. A modern writer thus defends voodoo rites in Haiti: "Let religion have its bloody sacrifices, yes, even human sacrifices if thus our souls may be kept alive. . . ." From *The Magic Island*, by W. B. Seabrook.

the calm voice of reason, still tend to regard the "second man" within us who bids us behave with seasoned propriety and decency as rather an odious spoilsport.

And a chivalrous exception has been made, by men at least, in favor of sexual emotion. The woman who is overcome by such a feeling is in old-fashioned communities an object of contempt and amusement, and this past pressure of public opinion has taught women a certain measure of control. Intelligent women automatically look before they leap into love. Such calculation has not been held quite honorable in men, and has naturally come to be considered more difficult for them.

But it can not be impossible. Though most popular novelists would have you believe that love happens to you, like the measles, without your consent, there are dissenting opinions even among them. One I quote: "There are for a man more ways of falling into that state than romancers would have us to believe, and one of them is by an assent of the will at a certain given moment, which the heart promptly follows—just as a man in a moment decides he will espouse a cause, and soon finds himself hotly fighting for it body and soul."*

This to a woman seems not merely one way of falling in love but the only sane way.

And I do not see how you as an intelligent man can help entertaining a feeling of suspicion when you are asked to do anything without due consideration. Does not the mere assumption that love will not bear thinking about suggest to you that it is a commodity to be all the more carefully examined?

As a matter of fact the physical attraction commonly mistaken for love is the easiest kind of emotion to classify and keep within limits. It is not only that it is not, in itself, lasting; this might not help us since though we may see ahead few of us can feel ahead. But with all of us physical attraction is not only temporal but fluctuating. It is, of course, not a mysterious emanation from the object of desire but a condition wholly within our-

*Owen Wister, *Lady Baltimore*.

selves, and it ebbs and flows. We have only to take ourselves off on an outgoing tide and we are free.

The ancient advice to try separation as a test of love was of course a device to determine whether or not the attraction was of this physical nature. But it is not an infallible scheme; for imagination is still capable of building up and worshipping an image which, though it may hardly resemble the original, enables the fond heart to grow fonder in absence. The real test is to go away, stay a while and come back; if there is obvious incongruity between the vision of your dreams and the reality you have been mistaken in your devotion.

It is, however, quite unnecessary to travel if you are capable of detaching your mind from the physical wherever you are. In a magazine article on another subject a writer asks a rhetorical question which illustrates the process: "Suppose that you were to intellectualize love, to classify biologically the object of your affections as a mammal of the species *Homo Sapiens*; to make an anatomical study of the nervous, vascular, muscular and osseous systems, to weigh the chemical constituents of the beloved—as they have done at the Natural History Museum—so much carbon, so much water, so much iron, so much sodium chloride, and so on; or if you were even to psychoanalyze her character, the reactions, complexes, responses, inhibitions, censors and the like, would not love fly out of the window and vanish into thin air?"* The answer is, I believe, that if your love can be dissipated by such a test it is not love at all. But I doubt if a better way has been found to dispose of sex attraction.

Love that is to last a lifetime (and whatever the permanence of marriage in fact, assumption of its permanence is a safeguard in choice) might as well undergo all possible tests; for you may be sure that life itself will not stop at testing both anatomy and character. Certainly if your affections can not survive surface change you will find yourself sighing sadly at the last

*"Religion Goes to College," by Herbert Parrish in the *Century*, January, 1929.

SHE WALKS IN BEAUTY

"He loses her who gains her,
Who watches day by day
The dust of time that stains her,
The griefs that leave her grey,
The flesh that yet enchains her
Whose grace hath passed away."*

Marriages might be happier on the whole if the lover's regard were subjected to a trial as severe as that suggested by the man who ordered a typewriter sent to China, and told the shipper to pack the machine carefully and toss it down two flights of stairs; if it survived this treatment it might be expected to reach its destination. You may be sure that I, as a confessed romanticist, would not urge you to these cold-blooded considerations did I not feel sure that the genuine and valuable variety of love would be able to justify its existence. The fact is I suspect that when we have learned to examine our emotions more carefully many of the misfortunes commonly blamed on love will be laid at the door of s. a., and we shall prove the truth of the saying that men have died and worms have eaten them, but not for love.

55

SHE WALKS IN BEAUTY

SO thorough has been the world's determination to entangle masculine emotions in the matter of choice that one of the specifications which we mentioned has come to be regarded as an excitant to emotion. As a man you have no doubt been trained to a sincere reverence for beauty; you may also have come to find it an emotional stimulus.

Thus choice of a wife becomes for many men an esthetic adventure. To artistic considerations they will even sacrifice comfort, as evidenced by the popularity of beauty contest winners over domestic science experts. Traditionally your selection of a beautiful woman, whatever her other qualifications, will be ap-

**Ballades in Blue China*, Andrew Lang.

proved and understood, while your marriage to a homely girl, though she be possessed of other sterling virtues, will be condoned.

Women are quite well aware of this traditional touchstone, and most of them are unsure of appealing to you on any other basis. They have seen too many approving glances, as well as more tangible signs of preferment, bestowed upon lovely morons. Whenever you prove attractive to an intelligent woman she is likely to show her interest by shelving the intelligence and taking a serious interest in her clothes and complexion.

It may be hard for you ~~even~~ ^{hardly} to realize the magnitude of feminine vanity unless you keep constantly in mind that appealing to you in this way has been woman's job for centuries.

But of course you, as an intelligent man, are very well aware that physical beauty is no guaranty of mental companionship. You may even feel some embarrassment about becoming the reward in a beauty contest. Still there is this feeling for beauty ingrained in you; what are we to do about it?

Let's not fight it. Let's assume that the fairy-tale was true that made the heroine lovely—for remember, these are romantic requirements we are considering. Let's say you have a perfect right to a beautiful wife. But to make sure of no mistake you had best learn to be a connoisseur of beauty.

Now a connoisseur of prints or porcelains differs from the common observer in having an educated eye. He is able to perceive beauties which are passed over by the person ignorant of art; in fact, he may obtain special delight from a rarity made unique and lovely to him by its very imperfection. At any rate, in his search for varieties of beauty which he knows to be valuable the connoisseur will disdain a hundred objects beautiful to the uninformed.

And so perhaps with the connoisseur of human loveliness. I am not, I assure you, merely quibbling; I am convinced that your love for beauty when rightly directed may become as efficient an aid to you in making a romantic choice as it ever was in the practical selection of a healthy wife.

SHE WALKS IN BEAUTY

For physical appearance rightly understood is an indication of mental traits. The intelligent physiognomist does not judge character by the arrangement of flesh and bony structure as much as by the discernible impress of mental habits on the features. To see a selfish mouth, a wilful chin and lying eyes for what they are, be their outlines those of classic beauty, is simple enough for the connoisseur of faces. And you can see how it would come in handy for a man. In time I believe you even come to feel an actual preference for faces that show likable character, just as the connoisseur honestly prefers a good print to a chromo.

Of course there is no reason why a girl should not be beautiful by the accepted standards and have all the virtues and intelligence too, and your problem may be solved in this simple way. The only difficulty is that a girl who is beautiful by the accepted standards has from the beginning the same handicap that great riches would be to a boy. Everything is too easy for her. That is why if you ever do find a girl who is both beautiful and unspoiled you should—as you probably will without my telling you—try to capture her at once; for she will deserve twice as much credit as a plain girl would for being sweet.

In case it does prove necessary for you to exercise the judgment of a connoisseur and perceive beauty where others have failed you should have no difficulty if you really love the girl, for love conveys a special vision of this kind. You probably remember your mother as beautiful whether she was or not; indeed it has been demonstrated by psychologists that a man's standard of beauty is nearly always determined by his memory of his mother. This, of course, is because he knew his mother very well and saw her with the eyes of love. But you should know a girl very well, and see her with the eyes of love, before you marry her.

This transforming power of love works so well that its effects can be seen in the end even by outsiders. The fairy-tales of the frog prince transformed by the little girl's trust and the sleeping princess awakened by a lover's kiss are paralleled in real experience; confidence is a great aid to beauty, and any girl can be depended

upon to grow prettier if she sees admiration in the eyes of an intelligent man.

But it is doubtful if this possibility of eventual public justification ever makes any real difference to the connoisseur. Public blindness is his gain; while heedless shoppers are bargaining for rose-patterned mugs and gaudy gilded dishes he goes out quietly and happily with the one unconsidered piece that bore the proper marks, had the proper history—in short, was beautiful by virtue of intelligent association.

56

THE MAN WHO MARRIES A DUMB WIFE

FRANCE'S hero is apparently not without imitators in our own time. It hasn't been long since a group of college students specified that their ideal wives must not be so well educated as themselves. Psychologists these days are using a great deal of space in magazines and Sunday papers to warn women that all men prefer them to be dumb. Finally we have the example of Miss Loos' blonde heroine who noticed early in life that gentlemen preferred a girl who did not seem to know too much.

Let us look at the question first from the old-fashioned practical standpoint. We noticed in the early specifications that the masculine demand for beauty corresponded to the feminine demand for money, so that beauty was roughly equivalent to capital. (Industry was a demand on both sides.) Now imagine that a man is seeking not a wife but a business partner, and translate his preference for a beautiful but dumb girl into a preference for an associate with capital and industry but no brains.

What are your conclusions as to the senior partner's honesty? How long will the junior partner, if obtained, keep control of his capital; how will he save his industry from unfair exploitation? Somehow the proposition doesn't look any too good.

Of course I understand that the men who argue the ad-

vantages of dumbness in a wife are not looking for partners but for household pets or parlor ornaments. The puzzle to me is why they bother with marriage if this is all they want. Can it be a suspicion lurks in their minds that ladies of the Lorelei type, though they do not perceptibly travel on their intellect, do in fact contribute generously to the education of gentlemen who undertake to educate them?

Unfortunately ability to get what they want while appearing simple is not confined to professional pets. Wives may be that way too. The man who hopes to keep his independence by finding a wife who will know nothing but her place should reflect that no woman ever had any intention of keeping her place after she was married. The only difference between the varieties is that the woman who trusts her intelligence moves in the open while the others use devious and concealed means.

The truth is that since I assumed in the beginning that you were an intelligent man I find it almost impossible to imagine you among the candid college boys, or with the psychologists' great majority, or even with Lorelei's gentlemen friends in a preference for dumbness. Being intelligent you must, I think, realize that adoption of even the most charming and beautiful child wife is no way to gain a lifetime companion. You must see that only an intelligent woman could appreciate you.

Does not the appeal to a lower intelligence always argue a sense of inferiority? What first-rate actor ever shrank from facing an intelligent audience? What capable writer or painter does not at least claim to prefer educated appreciation to the applause of the ignorant?

Granted that you are strong-minded enough to fly in the face of popular opinion, that you not only do not object to intelligence but prefer it—even so your task of selection will not be easy. I mentioned just now that women have for so long been trained to appeal to you on other grounds that intelligent women will still hide their intelligence and emphasize inferior personal charms in dealing with you, and this is a very unfortunate thing. But the

remedy is as usual with you: you as the customer have it in your hands to enforce the law of supply and demand.

It seems unnecessary to mention to an intelligent man that mental values are a good investment;* that age only improves a mutual stock-in-trade of intelligence, as the stories of grouse in the gun-room multiply and season, and tastes, through congenial association, tend to grow similar.

Similarity then is again justified as a romantic aim. Similarity and equality; I advise you to invent, if possible, an intelligence test that will help you to discover a girl exactly as bright as yourself. It is true enough, I admit, that too much intelligence may prove a "wearing quality" in more ways than the complimentary sense in which the phrase was used by the ingenious Vicar of Wakefield.

But how can a healthy intelligence be satisfied to take its exercise cooped up in a bedroom with one dumb-bell?

57

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

I HAVE throughout this discussion of choice been telling you that the decision in various matters rests with you. The reason is obvious: you are, still, traditionally, the person to propose marriage.

If at any time the task of selection becomes too difficult you can, of course, resign your traditional prerogative. I can not help suspecting that nowadays your hold on it is slipping, and indeed I sometimes wonder if you ever held it without dispute.

True, that popular philosopher, Mr. Will Durant, said recently in summarizing the situation for his sex, "The initiative still remains with us." But some years ago, in the quaint Victorian age, Thackeray remarked: "Let them show ever so little inclina-

*In Doctor Hamilton's *Research in Marriage*, cited before, it is interesting to discover 77.78% of happiness among men who married wives better educated than themselves; 64.71% where the education was equal, and only 38.60% among those who knew more than their wives.

tion, and men go down on their knees at once; old or ugly, it is all the same. And this I set down as a positive truth. A woman with fair opportunities, and without an absolute hump, may marry whom she likes."

Of course for nice women there are limitations of method, and for women not so nice there are limitations when the object is an intelligent man. But nowadays I believe most people would agree with Thackeray that women are usually the aggressors and that, Mr. Durant's hopeful idea to the contrary, they are even capable of taking the initiative openly.

Not long ago a group of Young Women's Christian Association members agreed by a large majority that "Men and women should share equally in the initiative of finding and choosing mates." You see what it's come to, and the chances are that as an intelligent young man you've already had to turn down half a dozen proposals.

Of course really popular or successful girls rarely go as far as a proposal; they don't have to. They know dozens of ways to put you in a position where you have to do it yourself. But you, on the other hand, have probably learned as many avenues of escape.

Now and then you may sigh wistfully for the days when, according to report, they left the advances to you—when a girl might be worshiped as a queen but was lost if she acted like one and invited a man to marry her. You indeed may count it lucky if you have escaped the prophecy of Isaiah: "In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel!"

But while such tactics are still presumably fatal to their hopes, I trust you will treat gently all young ladies who make you offers of marriage, remembering that there is actually a difference in these things nowadays. It was formerly immodest for a girl to propose because she had only herself to offer. As that didn't seem like a great deal, much as it meant to her, pursuit was naturally left to the man who offered his worldly goods. Only queens,

whose worldly goods also counted, could reverse the procedure. But to-day, though a girl may have no worldly goods to offer, often a man hasn't either. So what difference does it make between them?

Common sense may reply, "None," but traditions are slow to lose their force. Swedenborg pointed out three centuries ago that woman's perceptions in these matters were quicker—as indeed they might be, considering the attention she was trained to give them—but he added that she must defer direct action to heaven, or suffer under masculine displeasure. And even to-day it seems fairly certain that most men would rather choose the wrong girl for themselves—that is, flatter themselves that they chose her, being indirectly approached—than have a less devious damsel make open advances. I hesitate to guess your own feeling; my best surmise is that although, being intelligent, you do not shrink from honest women, and pay them the compliment of an honest refusal, you find the whole thing rather painful.

But of course you realize that the **alternative**, if you are to make an intelligent choice for yourself, **is to** learn how to judge women unbiased by ancient customs and artful concealments, and indeed I think your only hope is to put your foot down firmly on the glamorous approach. The fact is that a man who encourages feminine finesse is doing exactly what a woman does when she goes to a clever little shop and pays six prices for a gown—one price for the goods and five for the flattery, atmosphere and so forth required to sell it.

His bargain may not be quite so good, for a shop has a reputation and future sales to consider, and so must maintain some standard. But the woman who sells herself either gambles everything on one venture or trusts to chivalry to prevent any warning from one customer to the next.

As a chivalrous man you might resent my assumption that because you have the initiative you are in effect a buyer with women in the position of selling you their society. But being intelligent you can hardly be too chivalrous to see that this is the

case, and I trust that you are able to discount some of the flattering attentions offered you as you would overtures from any other enterprise seeking your patronage.

Though you are an intelligent man I doubt if you realize how fervently, even to-day, most women wish to be married.

As an intelligent man your measure of success is professional, artistic, financial or political. But though a woman may have made a name for herself along one of these lines, she is never regarded as wholly successful if she can not prove at least one bona fide opportunity to change it. The average girl can not of course escape the assumption in many minds that social success, meaning popularity with men in terms of "dates" and proposals, is the measure of her attainment. Her claim to other ambitions may be politely accepted but there is always just a little doubt.

And so she yearns for matrimony exactly as when she goes to college she wants to join a sorority, or as you may have wanted to join an exclusive club; because she has, traditionally, to be asked.

Here I think is the one cogent reason for making the initiative mutual, with the referendum the same. Equality in approach may perhaps do away with the present system which puts the unengaged girl in the position of a freshman during rush week.

WE have now considered both varieties of marriage but only one variety of celibacy.

In an earlier passage I defined the second variety of celibacy as devotional chastity. Now I wish to explain that by devotional I do not mean merely religious devotion; I propose to cover in this classification all those, sinners as well as saints, who have espoused any cause with fervor enough to forsake families and firesides for its sake.

It is only fair, I think, to place the man who is married to his job with the man who becomes a monk; for our gods are those

powers we acknowledge as good and worthy of our devotion and sacrifice.

Also under this classification we may include the temporary chastity formerly understood to precede marriage, and which perhaps does precede it still in more cases than modern cynics would have us believe. This is of course celibacy in the devotional sense, for the young person who refrains from sexual intercourse before marriage does so, if not out of regard for a particular intended, at least out of respect for marriage as an institution. Thus temporary celibacy differs from the other genuine varieties only in the time element, and so needs no separate consideration.

Let us give the church the usual preference and start with religious celibacy, which has the chronological advantage.

59

VIA SACRA

RELIGIOUS chastity is briefly explained as a dedication of life to God in literal application of the command to forsake all human relationships.

To the modern mind this command is more usefully interpreted by the code of Saint James, who said that "pure religion and undefiled" is to "visit the widows and fatherless"—that is, feel and express active interest in humanity—while keeping one's self unspotted from the world; or of Saint John who asked, "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

It is a modern axiom that the usefulness of the recluse is apt to be impaired by an exaggerated sense of his own importance or an embarrassing ignorance about the thoughts and habits of his fellow men. To prove the needfulness of the human touch we observe that Chinese civilization failed not only to enrich the world but to maintain itself without outside association. Furthermore to-day we do not look to the cloister for leadership, not only because of religious prejudice, but because nobody advances from Mount Athos or Tibet with helpful suggestions.

The medieval view of celibacy was at least a social view. Monastic foundations were not lacking in social contacts in the days when learning and healing and other human arts were monastic monopolies. But the modern celibate finds it easier to escape the world; without a wife he may be too ignorant of domesticity even to write good advertising copy, though advertising is his god; without children he may be deaf to civic needs and blind to moral issues. And so, I hasten to add, she may be. Marriage may be narrowing, but at least it means thinking of two instead of one.

If the physical functions are considered as symbols, it may be significant that the sexual organs are the only parts of the body which are quite useless to the individual who abjures his fellow creatures (except the tonsils and appendix which are quite useless altogether). To the ordinary human being they are the link with society; they provide the impulse to human intercourse which is the necessary prelude to effective accomplishment. On the other hand, the celibate may be perfectly correct in considering them entirely useless vestigial organs to be forgotten by those who have outgrown their use.

The real test of the efficacy of celibacy must be, I think, whether or not the celibate actually overcomes not merely physical impulse but all consciousness of sex differences. Sex teetotalism is after all impossible except to those who are able to make no distinction whatever between men and women, themselves included.

Religious celibacy of the rabid and ritualistic variety is obviously not freedom from but emphasis on sex. It seems fairly certain that its origin was in the Oriental view of women as a luscious temptation; the eastern mind found sex so irresistible that it must forego all association in order to maintain its own integrity. But this attitude is so far behind us that it is hard even to recall it. We look with amused astonishment upon the Turk who acknowledges a sense of excitement at beholding a woman without a veil. And it is difficult for the modern mind,

aware of the power of taboo, to feel sure that a monastery whose ground is kept sacred from feminine feet isn't attributing too much importance to their tread.

The whole argument seems much like the argument for prohibition of alcohol.* The best case for prohibition is, like the best case for celibacy, made a matter of expediency—we can't accomplish much if we are drunk on either alcohol or sex attraction, and we are unsafe to ourselves and to others in a rapidly moving universe. The strenuousness of modern life often imposes celibacy exactly as the motorized age tries to impose prohibition.

But isn't individual conviction of the advisability of temperance and self-control the ideal reliance in both cases? And is not the concern of religion establishment of the ideal?

As to whether temperance and self-control are synonymous with total abstention it must be impossible for any human authority to say. The definition of chastity is too delicate a matter for determination by synods. To some people it means loyalty and decency in the married state, to others it means virginity, and the only thing most of us can be sure of is that the real evil in any form of material indulgence lies in its occupation of our minds. As my grandfather and Saint Paul have pointed out, it is the love of money and not money itself which is the root of evil.

It may however be noted that by a previous definition love was given the power to perceive the "best self," which by the Christian definition is the Christ in every man. Christian marriage thus becomes an agreement between two persons to see the Christ in each other, which is reminiscent surely of the monastic rule under which a nun became the "bride of Christ." It is hard to see a serious conflict, on such a basis, between the cloister and the hearth.

*See Mary Austin, "Amorousness and Alcohol," *The Nation*, June 23, 1926.

THERE can be no question as to the advantage, for many people, of absolute celibacy as a condition of work. He travels fastest who travels alone; so does she, once she gets free of the entanglements of custom and her own feminine inhibitions. Over and over the prophecy is repeated: "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married." More are the geographical explorations of the barren; more are the laboratory researches; more, it sometimes seems, are even the first-rate novels and long-lived pictures, though these things are hard to determine because some people legally married are not overcome by it, while others technically single are obsessed by sex relationships.

It is the latter state which interferes with work. Most human minds run on a single track. Most of us can not simultaneously pursue an abstract ideal and personal prosperity, and to only a few is it given to combine eager and conscientious endeavor with those material rewards essential to the successful lover. As a woman past the century mark recently announced, "Love affairs and financial worries prevent intelligence."

Even in the ordinary professions family life may confuse the issue. You may live cheerfully in a garret if you've only yourself to consider. Your wife may be the sort who doesn't mind that address for herself. But how about sanitary surroundings, school and social advantages for the children? Civilization has you there, except of course for the modern solution of birth control.

Devotional celibacy makes protest even then. You may find a mere wife a distraction, and indeed you may if you marry one of those child wives who so often prove attractive to the male mind intent on its own accomplishment.

Galahad may strike you as somewhat of a prig but you must

remember that he got what he went after. So strenuous effort is reasonably associated with a girding-up of the loins not only in the Oriental mind which makes celibacy requisite for the yogi before he can aspire to mind-reading or imperviousness to pain or suspension of breathing, but by the Occidental devotee of business or the arts.

It's true enough that sex has upon many people the effect of a narcotic, drugging them out of all semblance to their right minds. Upon others it apparently acts as a stimulant, producing feverish but often useless energy and hysterical elation. These effects may alternate in the same person, and even a mild observation is sufficient to class sex indulgence as an intoxicant, whether or not we consider ~~the poison~~ dangerous.

Celibacy, on the other hand, is merely a form of self-control, which in one form or another has given us all our victories. Man's real difference from the brute, it is axiomatic to remark, lies in his ability to conquer his own instincts. He has starved himself into supremacy. All that we have of civilization has been wrested by stubborn denial of the lusts of the flesh, in spite of the protests of our bodies. If we listened to unhappy animal whimpering we should never live in cold climates or take violent exercise; we should never even accustom infants to proper feeding.

Thus our association of sacrifice with achievement no doubt had its origin in past progress through denial of ~~unwise~~ desire. We have come to associate defeat with any triumph of matter over mind, of stomach or reproductive organs over intelligence. And when we resolutely overcome a physical desire we have already gained the feeling of power, the expectation of victory which is half the battle.

WHILE we are discussing physical matters it may be remarked that if the advocates of merely nominal chastity take a physiological stand they can be answered from modern medical science. Last century a physician was content to remark cautiously, "I have never seen a disease produced by chastity";* more recently an authority on the subject declares it a "lie that continence is dangerous to health, for the opposite is true."†

From the merely logical point of view it is always easy to reduce to absurdity, by a reference to observed changes, arguments based on physical necessity. Many of nature's indiscriminate methods have already become unthinkable to us. Savages satisfy hunger with food that to the civilized mind is not food at all; most of us would starve amid a plentiful supply of ants and caterpillars, highly as these insects are esteemed as articles of diet among less fastidious peoples.

We simply prefer hunger to foods which we regard as disgusting. And taste in these matters is not a racial inheritance; it can be cultivated in one lifetime, is now cultivated by vegetarians who soon come to see the juiciest steak as a chunk of dead cow and the tenderest pink ham as the sliced corpse of a pig.

We may go further and say that if we are to be interested in bodily sensation alone it is absurd to confine that interest to sex in these days when other new and marvelous sensations are to be had for the asking. There is, for example, the sensation of speed; you may search long without finding a bodily delight to surpass rapid progress in a motor-car or an airplane, if you hap-

*Dr. Paolo Mantegazza in *La physiologie de l'amour*. Quoted in Bureau's *Towards Moral Bankruptcy*, with many other authorities to the same effect.

†J. Arthur Thomson in *Towards Health*. With Patrick Geddes, Doctor Thomson is the author of *The Evolution of Sex*.

For further confirmation see the statement, "Continence in Relation to Social Hygiene," adopted by the British Social Hygiene Council and signed by Doctor Thomson, Dr. A. M. Carr-Saunders, Julian Huxley and other well-known authorities. *Journal of Social Hygiene*, December, 1927.

pen to like that sort of thing. Or why not a motor-boat? You may have a very nice one for less than it will cost you, very likely, to support a wife.

We have also the testimony of Alpine climbers that no delight is greater than that of conquering an ice precipice. Yet how many of us are content to live without that thrill, without even seeing the Alps! And when you have seen the Alps there are the Himalayas. . . .

Sexual adventure is easy; we may have it without stirring from our neighborhoods. But so, for that matter, is the adventure of death.

And if we are to argue that no life is complete without this particular adventure we might as well assume life's incompleteness without the fun of collecting postage-stamps or the pleasure of driving from Sorrento to Amalfi.

The trouble with the sexual adventure is that too often, like death, it excludes further adventure. Bacon pointed out the sober fact that "He that hath wife and children hath given hostages to fortune; for they are impediments to great enterprises, either of virtue or mischief." No doubt this is the moral of a legend that the Shah of Persia possessed a gold casket set with emeralds, and blessed by Mahomet, which would make its owner invisible at will provided only that he be celibate.

In commenting on a criticism of Thoreau's solitary life a reviewer* remarked, "Emotional warmth is a pleasant thing to feel. So is furnace heat or the glow of a roaring fireplace at Elmwood. But suppose you are Stanley and wish to know what there is at the heart of Africa. Suppose you are Shackleton or Peary and wish to know what is at the North Pole or at the South Pole. If you are really bent on getting there you will dispense with furnace heat and the consummation of love and you won't talk as if the sacrifice were tragic, either. If any one says that you turned polar explorer because some schoolgirl married

*Stuart Sherman in the New York *Herald-Tribune*.

your brother instead of you, you will know what to think of him."

It's all a matter of what you decide to give up.

In advising us the world at large, it must be remembered, doesn't care tuppence about our personal enjoyments and achievements. The world wants us to get married; it doesn't care how.

The law of the herd is marry and beget offspring. Malthus hasn't made a dent in centuries of ingrained conviction that numbers are an unmixed blessing. We may have employment problems and housing problems and wars resulting from overpopulation, but we haven't got over a savage instinct to rejoice at an addition to the tribe. And so we snigger and shove our friends into matrimony, so we throw rice at the wedding and grow sentimental with them when they become parents.

The ambitious young person aiming to hoe another row will find arrayed against him, besides friends and frequently family, the united forces of literature, tradition (though hardly history), popular art, ditto music, orthodox religion and the movies. He or she will be assured over and over again that there's no satisfactory single blessedness, no immortality like the clasp of a baby's fingers, and so on.

There's a dangerous grain of truth in each statement: love is lovely and children are really nice. But it's amazing how hot air and pressure expand these grains until, like breakfast food, they are many times their original size.

Does fervent recommendation of orthodox living by the orthodox, in disregard of their own frequent unhappiness, have anything in common with the human impulse which moves the sophomoric hazing of freshmen?

At any rate, to escape the net that is spread for you by those already imprisoned is to prove yourself possessed of no mean powers of resistance to hypnotism, mesmerism and mob psychology.

HAVING looked at what we may call voluntary celibacy, we have still to consider the plight of that great part of the human race which comes last in the verse popularized by Mr. Ford Madox Ford. "Some do not," not from choice but from the exigencies of circumstance. In the great game of pussy-wants-a-corner they were left out.

And if it is important for the voluntarily celibate (or as we may some day discover, for the voluntarily married) to realize the unimportance of mundane relationships, how much more necessary is this realization to the unintentionally single! In the days when vulgar conceptions of psychology make thwarted sexual desire the cause of every ill, and the necessity for self-control the great tragedy of existence, it is reassuring to be told *About Ourselves* that "As a matter of fact, most of our life must be lived with the kind of loves that are not sexual. . . . Sublimation, then, is the lot of all of us."*

The fact is, of course, that as other observers have pointed out, we may accustom ourselves to sublimation until it becomes for us the natural thing. To the lower animal which spends its life in eating even a temporary deprivation of food must seem distressing; it has no resources, bodily or mental, to continue. Such a creature could not understand the human system that can not endure constant feeding, but must engage between meals in other occupations even when not strictly necessary to insure the food-supply.

Custom is important; custom that changes slowly, imperceptibly perhaps, but still changes. And the man or woman who faces the world alone to-day can find consolation in the fact that customs are turning more and more surely to favor single life. Apartments which forbade children are being followed by buildings planned for spinsters and bachelors. More army cots than

*H. A. Overstreet.

“SOUR GRAPES”

four-posters are sold by the furniture dealers, and nights once dedicated to love or lonesomeness are being turned into dynamic day. We are assured that “It is a fairly safe prophecy that in fifty years light will cost about a fiftieth of its present price, and there will be no more night in our cities. The alternation of day and night is a check on human activity which must go the way of other spatial and temporary checks.”* And the way, perhaps, of the desolate lover’s dreams—for other scientists are speculating on the possibility of reducing sleep. If they succeed we shall have one more instance of “natural instinct” overcome in the interests of fuller living; another example, in fact, of what they call sublimation.

But always, I think, the most important thing to remember is that celibacy of even the so-called involuntary sort is actually a question of choice. With a few physically different exceptions, that is, almost any one can have marriage of some sort. You may not marry the person you chose first, and if you choose to marry no one else well and good, but your celibacy is voluntary. So with economic considerations: by going lower in the scale of living you can always find some one willing enough to share your circumstances.

You are, in short, in almost any condition of celibacy, choosing it for yourself; you have identified it with comfort, or peace, or grace and dignity, or common sense. So, for you, the grapes *are* sour; so you are entitled to wear your rue with a difference, and so your case is summed up neatly in the verse:†

“Sometimes when people pity me
I tell them with no rancor
That for what it costs me to be free
I might have bought an anchor.”

*Haldane, *Daedalus*.

†By Witter Bynner.

WE have now considered the two varieties of marriage and the two varieties of celibacy. I hope you have not been annoyed in the discussion by my assumption that there is a closer connection between nominal celibacy and practical marriage than between the two varieties of marriage, and a closer connection between genuine celibacy and romantic marriage than between the two varieties of celibacy.

For as the practical connection was apparent in the first grouping, in the second I think we have romance in common: the devotional celibate, temporary or permanent, exhibits always a romantic preference for the bird in the bush.

As this is a guide-book and not a reform treatise I shall certainly make no representations as to which of these plans of life you should adopt. I should consider it as little my place to urge you to choose the romantic instead of the practical plan as to advise, within either plan, the choice of marriage instead of celibacy or vice versa.

Nevertheless, I must call your attention to one difference between the plans which seems to be significant.

In consideration of the so-called practical plan we discussed first, you had freedom of action within the limits imposed by external circumstances. You might have to work hard all your life as the husband of a helpless wife and the father of children who took after their mother. You might have merely to pay blackmail or alimony. You might have unforeseen unpleasantnesses of various sorts, but you were called upon to exhibit no particular personal self-denial or self-control. The main difficulties of this practical life, it seemed, were likely to come through other people.

In the second or romantic plan the greatest part of the struggle seems to be with yourself. You are the keeper of your own liberty, and you are called upon to be a stern keeper. In the case of celibacy this is obvious enough, and I think we saw that

WHAT NOT TO DO

in romantic marriage it would be no less necessary to exercise self-restraint both in choice and in the maintenance of an equal relationship.

And now your intelligence is needed. An unintelligent man might conclude at once, as so many of them (and of women too) do conclude, that freedom of action offers a far more attractive prospect than self-control.

But as an intelligent man you can not fail to notice that if in the first case your difficulties came from the outside you can not actually control them, and in the end they may offer insurmountable obstacles to your freedom. You can never be sure of keeping it intact after all.

Whereas if the struggle is not with circumstances but with yourself you may be confident that you control, with yourself, the issue.

If you now choose the bird in hand of practical freedom we need not go further, I think, for the course of events is no longer in your hands. I shall say good-by and good luck to you.

If you are still interested in the romantic struggle we have more ahead of us, for we can not have controlled action without principles and rules of some sort. Which brings us, not by way of religion, propriety, or other accepted path but by a romantic wish for individual happiness, to the question of a moral code.

64

WHAT NOT TO DO

BEFORE we adopt a new morality we may do well to consider what mistakes the elder moralists put into theirs, lest we do likewise.

The chief difficulty with the old morality seems to be that it was made for sinners, and so the sinners flourished. I do not mean to say that a moral code should be made for saints, who obviously do not need one, but rather that a code which assumes the inevitability of instincts which are in fact obsolescent is not only ineffectual but in itself demoralizing.

For the old morality is only too well represented by that phrase in the prayer-book about the gift of continence. Its exponents chose as their basis for matrimony the same human weakness more frankly catered to in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. A brave attempt was made to separate the sheep from the goats while retaining, like the late Mr. Munsey's newspapers, the best features of each; but mainly, I think, we may say that the effort of our civilization has been to domesticate lust, to bind the Hunter with pink baby ribbons and dampen hell's bright flames to hearth-fire dimensions. For generations it looked as if it might be possible, but now we know that if it ever could have been done it would have been done by the Diamond Jubilee.

With sex as its foundation the moral structure was bound to be a house divided. And a peculiar thing about the sexual division was that the moral code for men was largely dictated, though not successfully imposed, by the "good woman," the matriarch; while morals for women were instituted by the "old man," the patriarch. Each sex has been zealous in its efforts to formulate a really satisfactory code for the other side.

Let us, if you like, look first at feminine efforts to straighten out masculine morals.

The world's firmest believers in sex differences are to be found among those good ladies who regard all pretty girls with suspicion and feel grimly certain that all men are satyrs. "Men will be men, my dear," they will tell you with bitter and contemptuous smirks which lend to this apparently obvious saying the darkest of meanings. Quite naturally then they find the whole duty of goodness devolving upon themselves. They can expect no co-operation from their weaker brothers; their only hope is to guide weakness into safe paths. They urge their moral sisters to lead men upward and onward by appealing to the brutes on the only ground where they believe the brutes can be managed.

Thus while s. a. has been losing caste among intelligent modern women who didn't want any advantages handed them because of sex, certain of these antique moralists have gone so

far as to represent feminine attraction as a duty, if used as a reform measure. Worthy motives, they explain, justify even this means; if you vamp a man for a good purpose the recording angel will understand.

As a representative of this group I should like to quote from the writings of Corra Harris, who has championed the cause of our grandmothers with consistency and considerable success, and has lately argued on their side in a magazine debate. Mrs. Harris is a valiant advocate of old-fashioned marriage, old-fashioned religion and old-fashioned common sense. She is also, I regret to say, one of the most cynical feminists I have ever met in print. As a sample of her opinion of masculine intelligence how do you like this?

"Husbands of all creatures require to be spoofed . . . The sensible attitude to take is that of admiring him as you do your little son when he masquerades as an Indian. . . . Your plain duty is to admire and flatter your husband. This may force you to warp your judgment, but do it."*

Mrs. Harris then points out the advisability of using expert professional methods. She regrets that while "We are ready to adopt the lurid colors and fashions of doubtful women we have not the sense to practice their wit with men even in the managing of our own husbands. What asinine conceit is it in us which prevents us from learning their arts with men?" All, of course, with the best motives; for, she concludes, "There is no way of computing the number of husbands who survived upon the shifting sands of their own characters, held in place by this mirror of admiration their wives furnished."

I don't know how this strikes an intelligent man, but I can tell you that the modern girl is apt to feel she doesn't want a man who has to be led so carefully. If men really are children who have to be cajoled into proper behavior, a case of arrested development might be a depressing thing to have around the house.

*From articles in *Ladies' Home Journal*, "On the Management of a Husband" and "These Husbands," March and June, 1925.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

As for the advice to adopt the methods of "doubtful women," while the inoculation theory has its medical adherents the hair of the dog that bit you is considered a dangerous moral reliance, and any intelligent woman should know better than to think she can separate the various sorts of s. a. and classify them according to their use as black or white magic.

Of the same fundamental opinion as to masculine nature, though on the opposite side in recommended practise, are ministers and censors and all persons who warn women against undue physical display lest they thereby lead astray their susceptible associates. A woman physician who went about the country addressing university girls made out such a case along this line that wearing chiffon silk stockings seemed, while she talked, almost as great an error for a girl as becoming the father of an illegitimate child or two could be for a man. The doctor explained it all very clearly. And one thought, as one listened, how men would not have been flattered by her explanation; how some of them might have wished to rise up and say, with the bus conductor, "Lady, legs ain't no treat for me!"

I think I have said enough to show you why the long-skirted moralists have been fighting a steadily losing game. Let us glance now at the patriarchal advisers who are concerned about the parlous state of women.

As an example of this group I propose Mr. Anthony Ludovici, who has published several fat tomes on the subject. I find Mr. Ludovici's works a fascinating study as a revelation of what one might almost call the Neanderthal mind. At least the ideas expressed seem to me nearer that age than our own, though they do parallel rather closely in some respects the more lurid preachments of the Old Testament, of Al Koran and of the Book of Mormon.

Briefly Mr. Ludovici is pained by feminine lack of enthusiasm for the pleasures of parturition. Men are not so concerned in the matter; "The reproductive or sexual obsession in Man is more or less an exception, or an abnormality."* But Woman—ah,

*From *Woman, A Vindication*.

Woman to Mr. Ludovici is as plain as Man to Mrs. Harris. "Turning now . . . to the contemplation of Woman, what do we find? We find a creature who stands up to her shoulders in the business of Life and its multiplication."*

And who, Mr. Ludovici adds in effect, is dead from the neck up. For he warns us not to take a woman's explanation for anything; unless she is leading a normal sex life her word is worth no more than a lunatic's (after all Mrs. Harris never went as far as that). And Woman is, according to Mr. Ludovici, only leading a normal sex life if she is bearing or nursing a child, when, also according to Mr. Ludovici, she is uninterested in anything else.

Woman, then, to Mr. Ludovici is something between an oyster and a guinea-pig. But he has her interests at heart. He wants her to be happy, and her full enjoyment of the sex process (he notes that she gets much more entertainment out of sex than men do) includes, he assures us, gestation, birth and lactation of the child. He is very particular about lactation; indeed this matter is so important to Mr. Ludovici that a Behaviorist might deduce an early distaste for his bottle.

And so in his moral code birth control is wicked. Celibacy is wicked. Bottle feeding is very wicked. Everything is wicked—for women—except multiplying and replenishing the earth.

True, Mr. Ludovici wants men to be happy too, and to even up for their better entertainment he thinks women should be willing to allow concubinage. Though, in Mr. Ludovici's world, it doesn't seem to make much difference what a woman thinks she wants.

But this idea offers a difficulty to the democratic mind. If all women are to exercise their biological privileges as fully as Mr. Ludovici advocates, practically all women will be engaged either in enjoying pregnancy, reveling in seven to nine months of lactation, or having a perfectly wonderful time giving birth to a child.

**Ibid.*, p. 41.

And where, in all this preoccupation, are Mr. Ludovici's menfolk to find their concubines?

Then there is another practical difficulty. If women are to become mothers with the greatest frequency consistent with undisturbed lactation, one woman in a state of health and exuberance might reasonably produce during a lifetime some fifteen children, not allowing for twins. At this rate population would reach a saturation point at a date much earlier than the one now fixed by scientists. As a remedy does Mr. Ludovici permit infanticide at the time of weaning?

It is, however, not quite nice to poke fun at Mr. Ludovici, for his intentions are really of the noblest. He begins with the assumption which he quotes with approval from Schopenhauer that the intellect is the servant of the body, and this, we must assume, is exemplified in his own case. It is inevitable that sex should count immensely with him, and as a modern woman writer has observed, "Men and women are no more to blame for being oversexed than a prize hog for being over fat."* With his disabilities Mr. Ludovici is unusually kind and thoughtful, for though he believes it necessary to make frequent demands upon women he can not bear the thought of their enduring any discomfort as a result. On the contrary, they *must* be happy. And so he convinces himself that only perversity prevents their discovery that the whole birth process is delightful.

But he does seem lacking in resource. Observing that the changed conditions of civilization have made instincts unreliable and invited physical difficulties previously unknown, he does not hesitate to postulate that children nowadays should be born with softer and smaller bones. One sees why it would never occur to him that the instincts of adults might be altered as easily, but there is no real need for any innovation when one of those returns to nature which Mr. Ludovici so approves will do as well. For physiologists have traced many of the difficulties of civilized childbirth to the vertical carriage of *homo sapiens*. Why not

*Charlotte Perkins Gilman in *Our Changing Morality*.

then, along with a return to natural lactation, a return (for woman) to natural travel on all fours?

This I think will give you enough of Mr. Ludovici's tendencies as a moralist for you to observe their resemblance to the moral ideas of Mrs. Harris. Both preach Old Testament morality—his, to be sure, that of Leviticus, while hers is that of the Methodist Church South—but the error they have in common is more fundamental even than that. Both seriously underestimate the capacities of the sex with whose improvement they are concerned.

I am convinced that there is no use urging upon women a moral code based on their irresponsibility. The reason—assuming its truth—for the ancient notion that "A bad woman is worse than the worst man" is that far from being a simple instinctive creature, close to nature on the one hand and to the angels on the other, she has in fact been trained to sex consciousness from childhood and so is quite well aware of her acts. She may be inexperienced but she isn't uninstructed.

Similarly, I suspect, the assumption of your moral infantilism made so rashly by women moralists is also a mistake.

The effort of both groups of moralists has been, you see, a rallying round the reproductive process, an effort to preserve and standardize it in some pattern acceptable to the vanity of one sex, meanwhile fixing upon the other sex responsibility for the whole trouble. "*You* like it!" says Mr. Ludovici, pointing a finger at Woman. "*You* like it!" says Mrs. Harris to the moron husbands.

The truth about both of us is, I think, that being intelligent people we are highly artificial products, almost as well accustomed to the suppression of our instincts as to their exercise. We have even developed mobility as a characteristic, so that on the whole we are able to adapt ourselves quite easily, in a generation, from nursemaid-housekeeper to stenographer-secretary, and from farmer-soldier to advertising copywriter.

And it seems to me that if we ever stop calling each other names long enough to evolve a moral code based on these considerations, it may have an interesting possibility of success.

AMONG the many brave efforts to revise our morality there has been, as far as I know, no attempt to establish a workable code on the basis of the actual unimportance of sex. Savage codes, as we know, were built on emphasis of the differences between men and women, and we have seen the same defect in what we have left of our old morality. It becomes more and more apparent that if we are to have a code not absurdly at variance with our practise and our inner conviction we must make it on the new ground.

To be sure there are people nowadays who want no code at all. Laws, they point out, are almost sure to be broken, and a law once broken is no good any more.

While any law not made of rubber can be broken its survival thereafter depends on whether the breakage is chargeable to human error or to the operation of another more powerful law. In the former case the law remains undamaged; in the latter case we are obviously the gainers by the new discovery. And in our own situation the most encouraging view is that we have a conflict between the demands of a world grown more complicated, more intelligent, even more interested in what are called spiritual values, and the customs of a world simpler, dumber and more material. We have tried to pour new wine into old bottles and the bottles have burst.

This is merely another way of saying that we have learned more of late than we have put into successful practise, and there seems to be some ratio, in the scheme of human happiness, between knowledge and performance. This human impulse to put knowledge into practise might give us the right to say, as they used to say about God, that if we have no morality it will be necessary to invent one.

But can we invent a code without the old fault of sex emphasis?

We must begin, I think, with the admission that no code can

or should be permanent; we shall have to recommend, as Jefferson recommended for the Constitution, that it be revised occasionally. Looking only toward a temporary measure, it is obvious that if men and women have been taught too much sex consciousness in the past our first job is to remedy this mistake. Though the error is mutual the measures for its correction are different, and we can not have coeducation on a common ground until we have remedied some centuries of bisexual education with at least another decade or so of bisexual reconditioning.

THE first lesson in a woman's education toward sexless morality must be concerned with the unethical character of most feminine privileges and of all underhanded rule of men. To a man it may be necessary to explain the peculiar point of view which makes the lesson important.

Some years ago the woman physician to whom I referred a moment ago was telling an auditorium full of university girls the physical facts of life. Out of an involved anatomical sentence one phrase was clearly accented: "*Only* by contact with the female . . ."

Her audience listened intently. Some were made uncomfortable by her descriptions, some were bored by her conclusions, but even though it was an old story they listened. She was talking about their power over men.

And while the anatomical explanation might be new the idea was not new to a single girl in the audience. Every mother's daughter of them had been accustomed from infancy to accept, along with and in payment for feminine disabilities, the idea that she would naturally be attractive and precious to men. The idea with its corollary of privilege is not difficult to instil in any girl not physically deformed, exactly as it is easy to teach a white man that he is superior to a colored man and so entitled to rule the latter.

The fact is, however, that if we are ever to have equality

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

and decency in the world we must do away with privileges that have a physical basis, simply because their exercise is inseparable from some form of slavery.

I mentioned earlier that abrogation of feminine privileges was one of the signs of current change, and this is true enough. But the change is not as yet universal. At present when some women are trying to be fair, the less conscientious are apt to be conspicuously successful. When honest maids come out in the open with their proposals and their powder, scorning to stalk the prey, the first apparently to benefit is the huntress who employs from feline ambush the tested weapons of witchery.

You may feel confident that rough vamping has gone out, but I must record a belief that a certain class of men (not of course very intelligent men) will still fall for the more subtle variety in a way that proves it is not generally understood among them how often the clinging vine is poison ivy. Even now they seem to go over like a row of up-ended dominoes when they meet what they take for a sweet, old-fashioned, feminine girl who will look up at them and listen to them and flatter them artistically.

You will realize that it is unlikely, though the designing creatures may seek to convey the opposite impression, that women feel any real need to lean upon you, or that they wish you to think for them except about such dull matters as earning a living. You will remember my warning that no woman expects to be managed after marriage. But what of those who underestimate feminine resources?

Often it seems regrettably true that a wife can keep even an intelligent man at her teetering heels if she's willing to pay the price in self-respect. She can wheedle. She can cry. She can drape herself around his neck and whisper in his ear. She can put on her prettiest negligée, fill his pipe and perch on his chair-arm after a good dinner to proffer her plans.

Or she can be pale and wan and ill. She can feel perfectly terrible. She can be overworked and ground down and miserable, and not appreciated like other men's wives.

And, most potent of all feminine appeals, she can be a Mother. "No woman is ever quite the same after Baby comes. . . ." Not to be denied things, before or after. No man understands, of course. . . . But the motherhood appeal made to any man above the brute level can hardly fail. You see how it couldn't. It might be fairer to bash him soundly over the head.

So far I have referred to recognized privileges, but this is not all. The fact is that a woman's ambition does not always stop at privileges for herself. She wants power too, merely for the feel of it, or to further quite unselfish and admirable ends. You can hardly condemn her for this desire, since you have it yourself; we all have it to some extent and it is harmless enough as long as the contest is open.

But we can and should condemn those who seek to influence us unfairly, without warning, and by physical means. Since their open efforts were so long doomed to failure it is easy to see how women acquired the habit of concealed approach, but from the standpoint of sexual autonomy the method is degrading to all concerned.

A man's deference to a woman's judgment is rightly held dishonorable if the only way a woman can reach him is through sex appeal, for then his deference is not to her judgment but to his own weakness. This simple moral point seems to be overlooked by many otherwise virtuous women in the pleasure of getting their own way. While it has been a tradition of both sexes to regard the other sex as emotionally unstable, men appear to have gone further in establishing a convention against taking advantage of instability. It seems difficult for a good woman to see herself as a corrupting influence. She can not bear for the man she loves to be deprived of anything he wants, and her vanity exaggerates the strength of his desire for her. Her only concern is for her own virtue, and when she is satisfied of keeping it or reconciled to its loss the scene of the Garden is played over and over.

One reason for Eve's carelessness is, of course, that she has little respect for masculine innocence; somehow she was taught none even in those days when general virtue was assumed. Men have been accustomed to regard women of the sort they marry as reserved, so to speak, for them, but women have not had this confidence in masculine virginity. There has usually been a Lilith in the background even if no Lorelei in the present; so that far from leading him astray the good woman felt that she was protecting a man from his own helplessness.

Moreover, under the old system a woman often seemed to feel that her only security, from an economic standpoint, lay in plumbing the depths of masculine emotion. She could only feel sure of support for herself and possible children when a man's response to her charm was absolute.

Now that excuse at least is gone. But for our further progress out of the sex consciousness of adolescence either women must come to regard their own precious persons as so much flesh of little intrinsic worth, capable, if wrongly managed, of being unclean and troublesome but hardly of being mysteriously pure and elevating, or men must become brutally frank in resisting feminine toils.

Confucius was reported to complain: "It is finished; I have met no man who loves good as much as he loves women." And indeed, rather than require men rudely to dissociate themselves from half the world, it would seem wise to suggest to the so-called better half a more honest method of behavior than the practise of winding men around nicely manicured fingers.

We saw how signally the elder moralists not only failed to do this but sought to maintain the ancient system. Moreover, to their thinning ranks are now added the glittering cohorts of one of the largest and richest modern industries—the beauty business.

Under beauty aids we may, I think, classify not merely cosmetics and coiffing but the extravagances of dress and millinery, all those clothes which are so much more than practical and presentable garments. Their loveliness is their sufficient excuse

for being, but not content with this their venders must carry on an unremitting appeal to feminine self-consciousness, sex consciousness and vanity.

Men are taught to associate love of beauty with love of women; women are taught to associate love of beauty with love of themselves. Men are taught reverence for a woman's body as sacred; women are taught the same thing. On this point we have no reciprocal relations, merely a similar object of love and respect. And while love and respect for another's beauty and another's body may be admirable, the case is somehow different when the body and the beauty are one's own.

Next to looking at herself, it has been remarked that a woman likes to look at another woman for purposes of comparison. It is an axiom that women dress most fastidiously for one another's inspection; if they dressed for the majority of (not too intelligent) men they would pay no more attention to the dictates of smartness than is paid by the designer of costumes for a Ziegfeld chorus—the rule with Mr. Ziegfeld being, according to report, not "How much can we leave off," but "Make 'em remember that little schoolgirl sweetheart." The fact that women pay no attention to this discovery which has worked so well for Mr. Ziegfeld argues that for them what was once a sexual lure has become an art with the appeal directed, naturally, to the best-informed critic.

So we have the really smart women's club one of the best turned out gatherings in the world; so we have pretty girls on the covers of women's magazines, and the most popular male movie star a flop at advertising cosmetics.

Nevertheless, while a woman may realize that other women are her most intelligent critics and dress consciously for them, it must be remembered that a certain amount of masculine approval is a proud ornament to wear among her own sex. She will continue to want male admiration too, and the effect of all this greed for applause is quite naturally a worship of the whole body which psychologists appropriately deplore under the name of narcissism.

This must be understood as quite a different thing from the

appreciation of real beauty and the willingness to work for it which has in recent years so improved the physical average among both men and women. The latter esthetic appreciation has, as almost any one can see, resulted in the development of types which indicate as the ideal standard the youth of either sex before sexual characteristics are fully developed. Cropped feminine heads like whiskerless masculine chins are an approach to the sculptor's, not the sexophile's, joy. The woman who works overtime to look young may be hoping to extend the limits of sex attraction, but on the other hand, she may have a simple and understandable artistic preference for the appearance of youth. There are innumerable interpretations of charm which have nothing to do with sex; in fact, people too old or too young to be affected by sex consciousness are usually most charming of all.

Hence, abrogation of the peculiarly feminine appeal would not mean any less beauty in the world.

But how, with all the advertisers and the movies and the fluffier fiction, to say nothing of the moralists, upholding sweet femininity, can we expect any change?

The answer is that circumstances nowadays, plain every-day experiences far more convincing than any persiflage, are often such as to present women with a more wholesome view-point. For a variety of reasons they are finding out that they have been badly trained and must train themselves all over. They are discovering that their own support of a feminine aristocracy of beauty and laziness worked most harm to themselves.

For all women can not be ravishingly beautiful, and of those who are some must be more beautiful than others. Then to even the most ravishing must, alas, come wrinkles or gray hair or a superfluity of chins. Moreover, the division into "smart-looking" and "pretty" has been made for types as for clothes; there are women who are beautiful to other women and to intelligent men, while the old-fashioned pretty girl continues to attract more ordinary masculine admiration. The former type may find it necessary to work quite as hard as if she were downright homely.

ACCLIMATING ADAM

In short, after being assured plainly by fiction writers, and euphemistically by every one else, that a girl has only to be charming and agreeable and feminine for love and fortune to drop in her lap, the modern girl is forced to face the harsh fact that results may be uncertain and that the methods themselves are questionable.

Perhaps she will discover for herself what to do next, because she has already done a great deal. To make her mind equal to yours she went to college. To keep from having to marry unattractive and stupid men for their support, instead of waiting for you, she learned to make her own living. To keep you from having closed chapters in your mind she has gone after experience to equal yours. Now, that she may have you sober instead of intoxicated, controlled always by your intelligence, she must sacrifice her most valuable monopoly of feminine mystery, with accrued privileges.

The last step may be hardest of all; that will depend on your attitude. As it is the only step which can free you—and of course, the woman who loves you—from sexual tyranny, it is not unreasonable that a corresponding sacrifice may be required from you.

67

ACCLIMATING ADAM

IF women are to give up their efforts to control men by secret means the corresponding revolution in masculine character must be a similar resignation of special privilege. The special privilege owned by the male is, of course, his immemorial custom of going off and learning about life as far away as possible from the woman who is romantically supposed to be his companion.

I know that any proposal to shackle this traditional freedom is apt nowadays to be resented, and I am not urging any reforms. I am not begging you, for example, to behave yourself soberly for the sake of possible children. God is said to take care of children and intoxicated men, and it is useless to deny this may happen even when they stand in the relation of parent and child.

But it is only fair to tell you that experience, sophistication, whatever you want to call it, is no longer the asset for a man that it once was in his dealings with women.

A woman who knew nothing of the world might be thrilled by a man who knew all, but that was because she did not realize what it was he knew. Only green girls are fascinated by Lotharios. Just as you are intelligent enough to value self-control in women, so intelligent women value it in you; for intelligence sees clearly the connection between self-control and genuine sophistication.

The latter is defined by popular understanding, if not by the dictionary, as a superiority to the ordinary gaucheries of life which places its possessor above the common herd; an aloofness, a wariness—in short an intelligent refusal to be taken in. It will be noted that by this definition sophistication is a negative quality; it consists not so much in doing the right thing as in not doing the wrong thing. The sophisticated person may leave undone things which he should have done, but he may not do those things which he should not do.

It is difficult then to see why having done things which he should not have done should make him sophisticated; to see, that is, why sophistication should be confused with experience. Assuredly a man is not sophisticated at a time when he is making a fool of himself; why should having made a fool of himself in the past render him sophisticated in the present?

Let us suppose a parallel case in finance. We wish to know that a man is financially canny; not to be cozened by get-rich-quick schemes or trapped by salted holes in the ground. Will we be convinced of his financial sophistication by the fact that he has purchased a hodful of gold bricks, a choice assortment of prettily engraved oil stock or even the Brooklyn Bridge? If he has these things to his credit undoubtedly he has had experience, but will his experience make him sophisticated, which means immune from more of the same? Confidence men circulate prospect lists on the theory "Once a sucker, always a sucker"; if a man tries to find the pea to-day, he will invest in shares in the post-office from a

ACCLIMATING ADAM

pleasant-faced stranger to-morrow. Financial canniness implies stern suppression at all times of the universal desire to get something for nothing.

May not a similar suppression of irrational desire be the sign of sophistication in human relationships?

The idea in pursuing sophistication through experience is of course the same idea that is behind vaccination. But the analogy is not perfect unless one is a Christian Scientist, to whom having or not having smallpox may conceivably be a matter for personal decision. To the ordinary mortal smallpox is not a thing to be taken or left; it is something you may get all over if you haven't already had it on a little spot on your arm. 'Amorous experience is not, however, like smallpox to the ordinary mortal; it is like smallpox to the Christian Scientist in that it may be taken or left accordingly as one thinks about it. And whatever you may think about his methods otherwise, you will not find the Christian Scientist trying vaccination just to find out whether or not he wants the smallpox.

To choose to vaccinate one's self with unpleasant experience, therefore, in order to avoid further unpleasant experience, is a choice not compatible with intelligence. The intelligent person is not the person who tastes a little carbolic acid to see if it burns, and then decides to drink the bottle; the intelligent person reads the chemist's label and leaves the bottle alone.

Nor is the burned child the sophisticated child; the latter took mother's word for it and stayed away from the hot stove. The burned child may also stay away from the stove in the future, but what is to guarantee that he will not put beans in his ears or crawl in the well? The world is complicated, and learning everything by experience would require a longer lifetime than is usually vouchsafed to those who go in for experiment.

Moreover, there are those who acquire a taste for the experiment itself, and so remain perennially hopeful and gullible. A Byron or a Charles II is not sophisticated; possessed of experience, yes, but not of discrimination. As Mr. Havelock Ellis has

remarked, "A man may have relationships with a hundred women and develop much less character out of his experience, and even acquire a much less intimate knowledge of women, than the man who has spent his life in an endless series of adventures with one woman."*

Instead of being fascinated by his wickedness, then, the intelligent woman is faced with the task of forgiving Don Juan's missteps on the grounds of physical and mental weakness. And given a choice, independent financially, able to stand alone, I think you will find her less inclined to do all the forgiving. If you expect virtue in her she may wish to make sure, for the sake of that equality she prizes, that you are not what Mrs. Alving so shockingly described as "a fallen man." That lady, clever as she was, confined herself to thinking; but the modern solution to *Ghosts* is exemplified in *The Constant Wife*, in which the deceived lady first assures herself of an independent income and then embarks on a career paralleling her husband's. At least her plan has the advantage of a decreased sense of possessiveness and physical property values.

But if you do not approve of this solution, which is admittedly a chemical solution; if you agree with Trader Horn that "They can't lay the foundation of morals on a pint of lysol a week," you yourself must find another remedy. The one certain thing is that your monopoly of experience is gone.

Perhaps by putting your mind on it you can find a short-cut for sophistication which will be safe for all of us. Might not such a short-cut possibly consist in declining of one's own accord those things which experience would presumably teach one not to want? To want to do something and not to do it, to stand on the outside looking wistfully in—that is the obvious extreme of unsophistication which it alarms us all to think about. But to be above desire quite naturally, as we are above a desire for raw meat—that may be sophistication in one easy lesson. Certainly there is only one

**Essays in Wartime*, p. 186.

man who is unquestionably superior to feminine wiles; the man who is *not* looking for experience.

That there should be a change in traditional masculine habits and tastes is not such an unreasonable expectation after all when we consider what revolutions in this direction have actually occurred. For, while physical sexual maturity occurs in the teens and initiatory rites among savages take place at this time, civilization has actually succeeded in advancing the age of "experience" a few years at least. Among respectable English and Americans to-day, that is, many boys get safely through the high-school and prep-school period on the assurance that this early physical maturity is a relic of primitive life which does not fit conveniently into society as now organized.

The trouble is that the time of "actual maturity" has been advanced, even by lecturers on morals to youth, to the early twenties—the *old* date of economic independence. But how many men are even economically independent at twenty-one, to say nothing of being able to support a family? The son of even fairly well-to-do parents is at college, which explains why for many young men it seems that experience may be postponed as far as the university years, but no further.

Yet the popular conception of these things, even now, seems likely to err on the side of exaggeration. In *The Bankruptcy of Marriage* V. F. Calverton, whose general conclusions are on the opposite side, quotes from a questionnaire which indicated experience on the part of only 7 out of 26 Amherst men, and from a similar investigation among college graduates in which only 37 out of 100 men admitted sex experience prior to marriage. In Doctor Hamilton's investigation,* previously mentioned, 49 men out of 100 had no such experience, legal or otherwise, before reaching the age of twenty-four.

To be in keeping with changed economic conditions the "proper age for a man to marry" must be advanced from twenty-odd to thirty, and the moralists' objection to late marriage on the

**A Research in Marriage.*

ground of the practical certainty of pre-marital experience must be referred to the files which show, among untrained people, the practical certainty of pre-marital experience at eighteen.

Indeed, the argument for early marriage as a preventive of promiscuity seems a little naive. A man is invited to undertake the important job of selecting a lifelong companion because he is having difficulty with sex attraction, but if he can not solve that problem, how can he exercise intelligent choice? The result of acting on immature and emotionally prejudiced judgment may conceivably be chastity before marriage at the price of infidelity after.

If an innocent bystander may be allowed to make a further suggestion about masculine training, it would be to the effect that moral training which seeks to emphasize the importance of sexual abilities can hardly be an effective deterrent to their exercise in adventurous youth. Yet such emphasis begins even with those little volumes intended for the painless education of adolescence, which so often convey the facts of life by that very illustration of the apple which the writers of Genesis chose so long ago. The Snake, indeed, could hardly be more persuasive than their tendency to glorify the unknown; in one such booklet I counted four appearances of the alluring sentence: "It is all a mystery." My own recommendation to any very young person compelled to seek information in such sources would be to read the literature labeled for the opposite sex. It might at least foster some understanding of mental workings.

Even the most intelligent moral directions to young men seek to inspire carefulness by placing a high valuation on the whole generative system, and their frequent failure to be effective suggests that much masculine indulgence, obviously that of youth but perhaps also the "last fling" of the middle-aged, may be due to no overmastering desire but simply to a wish to test this much-lauded possession. With sex as extensively advertised as it is, perhaps it is as unreasonable to expect complete self-restraint in a man as to expect a child to keep a new toy put away in its box, or

a government with a glittering array of guns and battle-ships to keep out of war. We may even see in the tendency to grant special moral privileges to royalty a desire for the initiation of the heir-apparent whose person is public property. The system of sex worship has endless ramifications, and while, as with savages, one phase of worship might require self-control, repression as modern moralists observe was usually followed by some sort of spree. We have arrived at the stage of condemning repression. But to get at the root of the matter must we not condemn the whole system of worship?

To be sure, in another chapter I have said that the contrary assumption that we are all common clay leads to another variety of careless excess, and some one may say if we can not have emphasis on one hand or carelessness on the other, what can we have? But surely the answer is not too hard for an intelligent mind; can not we have a proper carelessness about the body combined with a sensitive jealousy for mind and memory?

Above all, before we see any worth-while improvement in the methods and morals of either sex we shall have to cultivate a new sense of fair play.

That there is a moral connection between feminine desire for secret influence and masculine desire for secret liberties is, I think, fairly obvious. It is not only that, as I have said, women are encouraged in unfairness by a cynical disbelief in masculine virtue. It is also that the two desires, though they often cooperate in action, are in effect mutually exclusive and so to be found at the bottom of all sex antagonism.

For how can women be said successfully to wind men around their fingers if half the time the men are gallivanting off on variegated and quite independent affairs?

And how, on the other hand, can a man be quite free and independent if he is even a half-time slave to feminine wiles exerted either selfishly by the vamp or nobly by the good woman?

If we are to replace antagonism with sympathy it will, then, be necessary to sacrifice at the beginning these childish deceptions.

A SINGLE STANDARD

LET us assume that we shall, by voluntary sacrifice of privileges, continue to minimize sex differences. We may do this consciously to secure a mutual accord, though it is also probable that as intelligent people we shall behave ourselves for ourselves, not from fear or hope of favor, but from personal preference for the graceful course. You may remember that at least twice before when we considered concrete problems we were forced to take refuge in a standard of taste.

When at last we reach a mutual ground may not intelligence give us such a standard, which will resolve once for all the question of the importance of the taboo by saying that the unimportant is undesirable and the undesirable is unimportant?

If intelligent people behave themselves from choice the fact is that they have already evolved standards of taste. It is possession even now of these standards which gives us, it is hard not to believe, what workable morality we have; which leads us to appoint certain times for certain experiences, and teaches us that to be greedy and grab out of turn is to risk premature age or arrested development, and so a loss of the symmetry in life that taste demands; which gives us a disgust for the unclean, and a distrust for the dishonest, and a scorn for the vulgar; which gives us, as well, an appreciation of genuine loveliness and patience to earn the latter for ourselves.

In time, when we have quite given up enforcing morals through fear of hell, we shall perhaps find them valuable as courtesies, as aids to romance or the hope of heaven. And in the refinement of force we may, as often happens, discover increased strength.

In such a time people may refrain from pre-marital and extra-marital experience as they now refrain, if they are polite, from eating before their dinner partners are served and from putting food in their pockets for private enjoyment. They may avoid

prostitution as they would avoid a grimy public towel or a germ-y drinking-cup; or even as they would avoid pollution of a friend's house. They will have regard for the essential small things that go to make perfection in any relationship as they hope for truth and beauty in their lives.

And they will do all this from choice.

A standard of taste does not require statutes, though it acknowledges laws. It does not compel, though its dictates may be stronger than compulsion. It is never insistent; it is merely convincing.

Taste simply assures you that to be eligible for the first-rate you must willingly refuse the second-rate and the third-rate. You must have a sense of values, a real respect for the genuine good and a sincere dislike for the imitation.

Taste includes appreciation of the good as permanent; as valuable accordingly as it is the result of honest effort; as beautiful when it exhibits proportion and restraint. And it is possible to apply these standards to human relationships and to draw practical conclusions from each one of them.

A sense of permanence implies that a man with one satisfactory wife will not want another any more than he would want another mother. The mark of honest effort is obviously the mutual sharing of responsibility, the unselfish endeavor required for the success of any relationship. The beauty of proportion and restraint is translated into good-humored understanding and self-control.

And the application of such principles requires no rigorous self-denial, no struggle with the devil, but an intelligent exercise of choice.

As there is no compulsion there is no condemnation of those who choose otherwise. There is, if you like, an inescapable implication of vulgarity in a preference for the baroque and the rococo—that is, the lawless and the over-luxurious. But the weapons of tasteful warfare are not carnal; they are the far keener blades of ridicule and distaste. Wickedness is robbed even of

its importance by its dismissal as a false quantity, a flaw in quality, a faux pas. The possessor of a good sense of values sees himself as fortunate, and others as unfortunate in their ignorance, not merely criminal in their behavior. So a morality of taste frees us from intolerance, though it gives us the terrible condemnation: "*C'est plus q'un crime, c'est une faute.*"

Another advantage of the standard of taste is that while not an elastic it is an advancing standard. As civilization advances taste urges upon us a greater refinement of values, so that the discovery of new powers does not leave us without a code to fit the situation.

As suitable in the ancient animal world taste admitted the virtue even of brute strength. Let the savage chieftain have his ability to "carry liquor" and "take women in his stride," along with his tangled beard, his sketchy sanitation and his habit of eating an ox for lunch. But when modern methods delegate to machinery those tasks requiring brute strength taste suggests another code of action. Not muscle but intelligence is required to direct our greatly magnified power. A sensitiveness that can not endure careless handling, a vigilance that can not afford intoxication, are the needs of the superior man of the present and of the future as far as our minds can reach.

Without unduly condemning the brute, taste presents him as an example of the childhood of the race—the stretching of muscle, the kicking and squirming and living in the body appropriate in infants. Similarly, in a somewhat later development, taste perceives the individual egotism, the emotional unbalance, the discovery of sex which we associate with adolescence. And taste suggests not only that we forego emphasis on the body, but that we control our emotions.

That is, we must do these things if we are to apply the adult standard. But are we ready to apply it? The only test, I think, is whether we are now able to perceive any imperfections in the standards of childhood and adolescence.

As we have gone along, I have assumed that you, as an in-

telligent man, were able to put aside consideration of the body, and that you were intelligently distrustful of emotion as having a physical source. But let us now, once for all, take a straight look at the physical and emotional claims and see what we make of them.

ON strictly physical grounds what can we expect of the human body?

Chemistry informs us that physically we are negligible creatures composed of very ordinary materials worth about ninety-eight cents in cash.

Biology reminds us that few animals, as animals, are not better endowed with strength or quickness, or keenness of sense perception, or some other quality which makes them our physical superiors.

Physics comes to our aid with mechanical devices which increase our power but which, misdirected, annihilate our soft and helpless bodies.

And finally, medical science confesses, with reference to this body whose care it has undertaken: "You may be perfectly sure that if you live long enough, you will grow old, and that when you grow old you will be unbeautiful and unattractive, and that surely death will come. When it comes, you may be certain that you will disappear like all the rest and that you will not be missed nearly as much as in your sanguine moments you have been inclined to suppose."*

This is discouraging; it is, in reality, one of those facts from which we instinctively recoil. It may be true in a sense, but it isn't fair. Look at man's achievements in the physical world; look at those mental achievements made possible by the body's help! Look at the sane Greek ideal.

And so on.

*From *The Human Body*, by Logan Clendening, M. D.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

It is rather pathetic and funny that we should so greatly concern ourselves about this field in which we can only hope to triumph by the intelligent employment of a proxy. Of course man's achievements in the physical world have been marvelous, but they have not been achievements of physical force. Time and time again it has been shown us not only that material force is useless of itself but that it can be controlled, molded, turned and twisted and bent into shape by mind.

We prate of *mens sana in corpore sano*, and then, thanks to the invention of printing, we read literature written by the physically worthless, the lame, the halt and the blind; we study history made by little men subject to gout but victorious by means of gunpowder, and we illuminate our pages with the aid of electrical contrivances perfected for us in our own times by a hunchback whose body would not have entitled him to any consideration whatever in a world of physically perfect savages.

As for sane Greek respect for the body, Plato was one sane Greek who never for a moment assumed, except for demolition of the argument, that the body could be powerful enough to receive consideration ahead of the soul. Greek respect, when you look at it carefully, was respect for a controlled body and therefore for control. It was in confident appeal to this Greek sense of discipline that Saint Paul wrote his famous athletic passage in First Corinthians.*

And the moment you begin calling physics and chemistry to the aid of the body, to say nothing of philosophy and religion, you have brought the necessity for control. We can measure our civilization by its restraints as well as by our increased powers, for they are inseparable. We deny ourselves in order to gain more.

Though we may quarrel about the ratio of denial to reward, it

*"Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? . . . And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. . . . I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection . . ."

seems reasonable on the whole that the ratio should be equal. To the extent that we are willing to give up crude and childish delights we are enabled to enjoy those of a subtler sort.

But the denial works best when it is unconscious, merely the natural outcome of a preference for something else. As a boy no doubt you had desires which would now seem to you well worth avoiding. Nothing has changed about the candy you liked then, or the profession of fire-engine driver which you yearned to follow, but you have changed. You have more and you want more.

The trouble with the materialist is not that he is greedy, but that he is too easily satisfied. He lacks discrimination; he will accept the second- or even the third-rate. He will take spoiled cheese when he might have had the moon.

Our caveman example of materialism in love is supposed to have carried off a mate from the next tribe without ceremony, and with so little respect for her possible intelligence that he was willing to give her concussion of the brain if that chanced to be necessary to the capture. As man ascended the scale of civilization ceremony was introduced and the taboos which hedge about human intercourse were increased, simply because man learned to value other considerations than the obvious material ones. To-day he wishes the pleasures of community respect, the admiration of friends and the comfort of a clear conscience; perhaps he even prefers a bride without concussion. At any rate, he restrains "natural" impulses, classifies certain things as not done and in most cases does not even think of doing them. The law he has made has become a part of himself.

What, if I may be personal for a moment, would be your own reaction upon finding yourself in a compromising situation with a girl you loved? Delight, willingness to take advantage, disregard of consequences? Not a bit of it. Distress, anxiety, discomfort, a desire to get out of there as quickly as possible—and all of these increasing with the strength of your regard for the girl.

This is because civilization has accustomed you to regard not only a girl's body but her mind. She has become an individual with feelings to be considered and protected.

As this attitude grows it is possible to imagine that an advanced state of civilization will come actually to prefer mental intercourse to the ordinary sort. For already we have come so far that we might go forward almost as easily as backward; we shall never again be satisfied with a merely physical world. All our talk about instinct and natural law and duty can not make us really proud of physical actions, any more than it can smooth away the pains of childbirth or the lifelong toil of breadwinning or the last dumb horror of death. Coldly materialistic logic may inform us that these things are of an importance all-high; Lust and Hunger are our twin driving demons, and yet a persistent sense of proportion continues to make us laugh at our wants, cover them with decent manners, and stifle them with sporting smiles.

To those who tell us that the impulses which we consider honorable and civilized are merely perversions of the basic desire for sexual self-expression, why can not we say that this desire may be on the contrary merely a perversion of the reasonable impulse to escape from physical limitations? We wish to get outside ourselves, to be freed from material bonds, to cast aside our bodies and walk among the stars. We desire a oneness with forces greater than ourselves—with the sun and the moon, and the wind in the trees, and the grass and the blossoming fields. We want to be everywhere, hold the universe in our arms and live for ever.

And we are only betrayed in these desires when, instead of escaping from our bodies through the doors of our minds, we tie ourselves to earth with bodily relationships that multiply instead of diminish our bonds. For we can not lift ourselves by our own boot-straps; our muscular energies will never bear us up. Whether we hope to assert ourselves by sinking thumbs deep into the gullet of an enemy, or by clasping an attractive member of the opposite sex madly to our breast, we are merely identifying

238

SILENCING THE SNAKE

ourselves with very mortal flesh. And so, instead of growing wings we give ourselves ultimately to worms, and for blossoming fields we find funeral clay.

But when we acknowledge a distrust for the body we have condemned emotion, since its visceral connection has been established beyond question. We know only too well that the emotionalist who thinks he is asserting himself is asserting instead merely his slavery to bodily impulse, advertising the fact that his soul

“is a stringed lute on which all winds can play.”

Thus, by way of the newest science we have come to define again the most ancient befuddlement, and modern classifications of emotional intoxicants closely approximate those works of the flesh mentioned by Saint Paul.

70

SILENCING THE SNAKE

IT may be all very well to say, then, that taste to-day is justified in condemning emphasis on physical and emotional considerations because we have ourselves shown evidences of outgrowing these stages of life. But how in the world is a mere dictate of taste to have any real effect? We have said “taste compels this” and “taste suggests that,” but we have not looked closely at the process.

Your childish ambition to drive a fire engine, if that was your ambition, was outgrown because you discovered that it stood in the way of a more desirable occupation. You did not sit down and consider the disadvantages of the fireman's life; you were not deterred by cowardice or snobbishness. And now that you have made your decision it is unlikely that any one questions your motives. Your friends do not say: “Aw, you couldn't ever be a good fireman! You'd be afraid!” or suggest that your mama wouldn't let you. You have simply arrived at a stage of life where you'd rather not; you know something better. Your taste has led you on.

If you prefer a scientific to a personal illustration, the psychologist who shows us how to control emotion by what he calls "reconditioning" is applying the taste principle every time. When he overcomes a small girl's fear of a rabbit by disclosing rabbit and lunch simultaneously to her view he is suggesting the simple course for all changes in the human view-point. She chooses the lunch instead of the fear, not from a sense of duty but from a natural wish. Similarly, the child properly taught the connection between fire and burning chooses comfort instead of the pretty candle.

When we, as adults, have learned similar good taste in choosing our associations—good with good, evil with evil—we shall have control of our emotional reactions, of our behavior, and so of our lives.

And now that we have evolved a hypothetical direction and method for our progress we are perhaps ready to evolve a convention that will fit men and women alike.

This convention for the whole of humanity will be, like the conventions for the lying lady and the philandering male, an ordinance against deceitful emphasis on sex. To hold our ground against sex differences in the future, we must not only cease to stress them for individual gain, but we must forego any temptation to return to the physical level on which sex is important. If the world is to grow up undisturbed by childish fits of nervous indigestion, so to speak, and adolescent emotional miseries, we must not be led by any one into states of mind which we have left behind. We must regard as accomplices of the unstriped-muscle Snake all who try to tell us that the happiness we seek is to be found in the range of bodily impulse whose limitations we have already discovered, or on any level lower than the highest one our minds can reach.

In an earlier chapter I took the liberty of assuming that you would overlook any unfortunate experience in a girl who had been hypnotized. But when you come to think of it, how many girls, and how many men too (perhaps not the most intelligent

men) are hypnotized in effect by mob psychology, early training, even the influence of respected authority?

For you may find, as Eve did, authority for anything. In our own times the natural man has become especially articulate, and when he speaks with the voice of assurance it requires a keen ear to detect the false accent of a stable-boy boasting in the parlor, anxious to secure public support by the blackmailing assumption that all the world is even as himself. But the tempter is more often ignorant than cynical, and more dangerous so. As almost every one has pointed out, the moralists must take their share of blame for the taboos which lend to sex the holiness of mystery, as the religionists must bow their heads over the inclusion of sex as a sacred factor in religion. Even the romanticists can not escape the taint of sentimental excitement, and all of them have undone their own hopes.

In suggesting a standard of taste in place of the old standards we can hardly, then, expect the immediate cooperation of conservative moralists of any school. Perhaps we may hope for the approval of science, whose method we adopt and whose invitation to exercise judgment unbiased by emotion we accept. Yet science, you remember, was the branch of human endeavor which made no pretensions whatever to reform human morals.

In choosing scientific methods of reconditioning we have not, however, really deserted that path of romance which first attracted us. For in the forward urge of taste we have the romantic requirement of an advancing goal; we have the search for the best thing which is the oldest and most interesting story. We have a place for the realist's warning, and the humorist's perspective, and the romanticist's promise, in our exercise of choice.

As for religion, it has always urged us to choose whom we will serve, to judge righteous judgment, and to take the good and leave the evil. When religion reconciles itself to forsaking the emotional appeal we shall, no doubt, receive its blessing.

WE have now considered the condition of your experiment. We have observed, after a fashion, the vast stores of information accumulated for your guidance by religion, science and literature, and we have examined the possible courses of action with their requirements as to method.

We have left the question of results. At the beginning we were inclined to the hopeful modern view that the solution of universal problems might be found in solving the problem of individual happiness, and so we have proceeded without reference to any duty to the universe. We have assumed that when we determined on a course it would be possible to pursue that course without waiting for the rest of the world to come to the same conclusion.

I see no reason to change this assumption. Relativity seems a reasonable physical counterpart of a law of mind providing for each individual a specially viewed and therefore different universe, so permitting individual movement without reference to the rate of movement of the herd.

Nevertheless, though we may reject the world's opinion the possibility of public opinion at some time coinciding with our own must be considered. We may, so to speak, set a style; and it may be a helpful criticism of our design to imagine it multiplied by popularity.

If, then, we are to reject, in marriage or out of it, the present emphasis on sex; if we are to marry only our romantic complements (or the people we honestly mistake for them), thus reducing at once the number of marriages, and have only children wanted by their mothers, thus reducing the number of children, let us see what would happen if the world in general adopted this course.

We may say at once that things would begin to happen to the Family, to the Home and to Population. But before we become too alarmed at the prospect of change let us look at a few

"FAMILY PRIDE MUST BE DENIED"

of the things which have already happened to the Family and the Home, and which are promised for the future of Population.

72

"FAMILY PRIDE MUST BE DENIED"

WE are taught to regard with horror, even now, any open threat against the sanctity of the Family and the Home. The fervor of their defense almost suggests that these institutions are so insecure as not to bear discussion, as some people felt that human attraction was at a low ebb when an English clergyman grew alarmed because one-piece bathing-suits at Brighton would surely prove a deterrent to marriage.

Of course the simple fact is that the Family and the Home are dissolving before us whether we continue to sentimentalize over them or not. Coeducation and birth control and improved transportation and newspapers and the movies are doing for us by suggestion what we should never have done for ourselves by reasoning; they are dissolving clans, separating parents and children and brothers and sisters and husbands and wives, reducing society to the individual and the mass. We may still say optimistically that "The whole structure of civilization rests upon the family," but if we do the only answer is so much the worse for civilization if we are to define the family in the ancient terms. For even when it exists the loose-jointed family of to-day no more resembles the earlier, more compact model than a handful of grass blades resembles a head of cabbage.

Fortunately our action is more reasonable than accepted sentiment. Already in many cases we insist that it is up to the individual to make good as an individual rather than as the member of a family. We actually stopped basing our civilization upon the family when we began to frown on nepotism in government or business. Since this altruistic abstention from what to the primitive mind seems natural family loyalty is now more or less established among us it is hard to say we shall not make further democratic advances within the family itself.

Indeed, just as we are revising our theories of romantic relationship away from the old notion of the dominant male and the yielding female and substituting for the one-head-of-the-house idea of marriage the idea of partnership, for the ancient idea of parental authority enlightened people are substituting the idea of companionship. Dad who is like a big brother and mother who is like a sister, schoolgirl complexion and all, are to-day's model parents, and this conception of parenthood slays at one fell swoop both parental domination and childish dependency.

We talked a great deal about liberty in this world before we realized that it must, in one sense, begin in the nursery. There the tyranny of personal limitations—the only tyranny that really matters—is begun, and begun, we are now informed, by the expectations of fond parents.*

Not only does the Behaviorist make plain the case of the inarticulate infant, the modern child grown older does not let his elders forget that families cramp his style. While the Behaviorist points out an early attempt to mold the child in the parental image, the child later resents failure to measure his own progress. Parents who would think it cruelty to send children to school in outgrown clothes do not refrain from assuming that because Johnny was afraid of the dark last fall he will be afraid of it this spring; or that Elsie who was vain about her curly hair at twelve will be vain at eighteen. So encouraged, it is possible that these faults will continue, but under proper conditions their continuation is no more necessary than continuation of the parents' faults. The real difficulty is with a system so imperfect that many concerned observers are asking despairingly with Dr. Joseph K. Hart: "How shall we get children *past their parents?*"

*"The home (mother, father, brother, sister, relatives) is responsible for what the child becomes. Nurture—not nature—is responsible.

"The home at present may be said to be a device run for creating the child in the joint image of the parents. Like father like son, like mother like daughter, is more than a worn-out platitude. It is a fearful truth. The modern child hardly has a chance for the 'pursuit of happiness' which our Constitution so kindly affords him. This conclusion may sound harsh and cruel, but Behaviorism tries to concern itself with finding out what is taking place."—John B. Watson, "What Is Behaviorism?" *Harper's*, May, 1926.

"FAMILY PRIDE MUST BE DENIED"

The whole process of growing up seems in many cases a prolongation of the agonies of birth, and a hastening of the procedure would be a relief to both parent and child. Sentimental anesthesia induced by tradition may ease the pain but it prolongs the labor.

Thus family life as we have it can not always be what God had in mind when, as the psalmist insisted, he set the solitary in families. The arrangement becomes unendurable to any civilized mind if it is to be considered as a succession of generations pushing ahead, following hard upon one another's heels and shoving for position. The world so regarded is a beastly shambles in which every man is

"The priest who slew the slayer,
And shall himself be slain."

Naturally the methods of succession have improved. Among civilized people instead of greedy interest in dead men's shoes we have children's loving fear for parents and parents' loving fears for children as sources of friction and misery. As children are handicapped first by parental dread and later by parental memory of them as minors liable to error, so parents are assisted into age by children who look for signs of decrepitude in hale and hearty elders at life's prime. Continual expectation of trouble of course makes trouble, as we see in the case of illness or business solvency, and so we are not much better at our best than the savages who drown their old folks without scruple.

If we were able successfully to overlook age and physical relationship we should no doubt be able to live together in harmony; age is only experience, and there is no reason why it should be a handicap or why youth should feel itself misunderstood. But the present fact is that difficulties do occur, and as the Behaviorists are urging us to leave our children alone and let them learn proper social conduct by association with other children, so some humanitarian may point out the danger to age of too much youth. In fact, I may as well admit that both sides of

the argument were well stated by my grandfather, some years ago, in the preface to *Misalliance*.

Formerly the only escape from family life was by way of practical marriage, so that new families were started in endless chains.

With modern marriage a game for two good-bys to the family will be more permanent, so in time we may see it vanish as the tribe has vanished.

And the Home? Almost at the beginning I pointed out that modern living conditions had altered it almost beyond recognition. True, in noting how extensively apartments had replaced country houses I was talking from the standpoint of your comfort, not from the standpoint of the Family. But you hardly need to be told either by me or by the landlord that a large brick-and-metal cube, vertically and horizontally subdivided into smaller cubes made accessible by means of a motor-propelled cubicle moving vertically within a rectangular parallelepiped, is no place to bring up children.

73

STANDING-ROOM ONLY

OF course the breaking-up of the Family is bound to affect Population.

Even now some of our best long-distance worriers have begun to consider this issue. Let us therefore suppose the very worst.

Suppose not merely that birth-control advocates and wearers of one-piece bathing-suits and commercial spinsters continue to multiply by their own method of contaminating the innocent; suppose a world filled with Shakers and hermits and other avowed practitioners of celibacy. Suppose, in short, that the whole process of human generation were brought to a sudden standstill. What would happen then?

The religionist, we may suppose, would solve his difficulties by laying the burden upon the Lord; saying to him, in effect, that if he made man to begin with he might manage to keep the

world going without human assistance. There is religious ground for the assumption in the Old Testament assurance that "It is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves," and the New Testament verse about raising up children from the stones. Those not religiously inclined might hesitate so to outline the divine action, but it is perfectly possible to guess what humanity would do.

With human life as with any other commodity, scarcity of new supplies would raise values and force measures of economy upon a careless and wasteful world. With no new lives crowding every moment we should begin at once to conserve the lives on hand. Children would be brought up carefully, with a consideration for their proper development now appallingly rare. Older people would be better treated too; we should devote more time to making life safe and comfortable and prolonging it to the farthest possible limit. And you can just imagine what would happen to any one who suggested a war.

While it's not at all likely that we shall find ourselves in such a situation it is easy to believe that the last years before the emptying of earth might be, on the whole, rather happy ones. To a detached mind it is difficult to prove that even the end of earthly existence as we know it would be such a calamity; it would be no loss to us if things stop with our own generation, and with our suicide record increasing how can we know that future generations would choose to be at all?

However, let us come back to more practical speculation. Suppose that instead of no more children being born, we knew that we should have only a few—say, a hundred babies, or a thousand babies a year. Would not the same conditions apply, in varying degree? Would not our care for these babies, our valuation of them, be in inverse ratio to their numbers?

I have put the question in this exaggerated way not to cause alarm but to allay it. While the ultimate reduction I have mentioned is inconceivable to us the plain fact is that modifications of it have been occurring among us for several decades. That is, we have had a falling birth-rate in England and among certain

classes of Americans without as yet any very disastrous results. On the contrary, there has been observed one very curious phenomenon which is only explainable by our conclusions regarding the hypothetical cases.

After pointing out that the birth-rate in England had declined in forty-five years from thirty-six to twenty per thousand, or nearly one-half, Dean Inge adds in an article in the *Spectator*: "It must not, however, be supposed that the fall in the birth-rate, great as it has been, has effected any considerable reduction in the rate of increase. [Of population.] For the death-rate has also declined in an unexampled manner. A line indicating the death-rate for the last forty-five years will be found to run almost parallel with the line of the birth-rate."

I do not know where the Dean got his facts but they are available to all of us in the article on "Population" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. There also you will find quoted, somewhat surprisingly, Herbert Spencer's conclusion that "the ability to maintain individual life and the ability to multiply vary inversely."

In the nice balance between birth-rate and death-rate a Christian might almost be excused for pointing out the workings of Providence, though Dean Inge at the moment confined himself to Malthus. And indeed, it would be hard to find a plainer moral challenge than the Malthusian discovery that the positive checks on population are due to vice and misery. The natural duration of life, that is, may be shortened by unwholesome occupations, severe labor and exposure, extreme poverty, improper care of children, crowding in cities, excesses of all kinds, diseases and epidemics, wars, plagues and famines. These things mentioned in the *Essay on the Principle of Population* are exactly the things from which the prayer-book asks that we may be delivered, and from which the moralist invites us to deliver ourselves.

Since with no obvious urge to action we seem deaf to moral entreaties about war and social crime and economic vice, why should not the moralist welcome on his side the practical prop-

osition that we shall be forced to a decent regard for life because of life's comparative scarcity?

We feel properly superior to the savages who considered that their own sexual behavior affected the growth of crops, and so allowed licentious festivals at the spring planting.* But while we expect no such immediate results, certainly we believe that increased population means cheap labor and plenty of cannon fodder—indirect aids to the growth of vegetation after all.

Of course we are not so consciously cynical. It is no doubt obscure impulse which goes back to our earliest education, back again to the earliest education of the race, which fosters this persistent greed for life—repetitious life that can wriggle and eat and hurt itself. Perhaps the first motive behind it all was fear, the fear of race extinction almost as strong as the fear of personal extinction and allied with it.

But why, in those primitive ages when we were forming our habits, didn't we look more closely at the animal world around us and discover Herbert Spencer's law of multiplication and maintenance? Why didn't we observe that diminution in progeny and longer individual life went together? Why didn't we notice that mosquitoes and fish which bred by the millions died likewise, while men and elephants produced offspring singly and lived longer?

The answer is that primitive man as he existed then, exactly as he survives in notable individual cases to-day, did not possess the ability to draw reasonable conclusions. It is only lately that numbers have ceased to awe us; only since we have learned to sterilize eggs and Pasteurize milk, and so lost our reverence for germs, that we have observed how, if quantity production were the measure of life, the world would long ago have been inherited by shad.

Perhaps there was no reason why, with an uncharted world on our hands, we should have come to the conclusion any sooner. To pioneers subduing a wilderness population was naturally

*Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Magic Art, Part I, Vol. II.

important, and the "chosen people" in every age have been the pioneers.

But we have observed that the frontiers to-day are those of the mind. And to hard-headed observers of a generation which has just seen its millions destroyed by war, the need is not for more children but for proper education of the children, both in years and in mind, which we now have.

There seems then no reason for distress in the fact that whatever we may say in poetry and in public, increasing numbers of us are dodging parenthood from plain economic pressure. The same economic common sense which urged the pioneer to raise more farm-hands now operates to keep down the family. Working wives, increased living costs and the passage of child-labor laws make the child an economic disability too great to be borne. As usual we are being forced to a new stand not from any reasoned or holy motive, but for the sake of our comfort and our pocketbooks.

And we have a right to the stand. When we are invited by excitable thinkers to marry some one—marry any one—and have as many children as possible or be called slackers, we may sensibly reply that to our view this would mean humanity going visibly to seed. For men and women to give up romantic and decent preferences merely to provide for their own succession can be noble instead of disgusting only when humanity is about to perish from the earth, not when we are confronted by a surplus of individuals crowding one another for a place in the sun or even standing-room in the subway.

Without birth control or other check, Darwin estimated that at a possible rate of increase the population of the United States alone might eventually cover the whole surface of the globe so thickly that four men would have to stand on each square yard. More recently a chemist* announced that if the rate of population increase didn't start falling within the next five hundred

*Dr. H. E. Barnard speaking at Northwestern University.

or so years there'd be left hardly more than a square yard of arable land per person.

Contrast the picture of such a crowded universe with our first picture of a world faced with the necessity of conserving life. Can you doubt which would be the better ground for the cultivation of virtue and peace?

THOUGH we may be indifferent to quantity no intelligent person can be indifferent to quality. The next argument for the Family will be the duty of intelligent parents to hand on the torch. By all means, say the eugenists, let us stop the multiplication of morons, but let us encourage intelligent people to reproduce their kind.

Since to the sentimentalist self-perpetuation will always be pleasing and sacred, we may expect that it will be some time before eugenic hopes yield to other theories. Vanity is hard to kill, and humanity is used to being told that parental love is the purest, the most unselfish form of affection. It is much more pleasant to believe this than to believe the psychologist's assertion that we worship ourselves in our children, seeing them, poor dears, as extensions of our own personalities. It is unfeeling in him to point out that we rejoice to observe in them our own virtues and we condone in them our own faults; that we are inordinately proud of the former and tolerant of the latter, thereby fostering both.

In short, in the three-sided argument between heredity and environment and individual character parental sympathies are, through mere human conceit, likely to be on the side of heredity. Yet surely they know not what they do. The more you study the theory in its far-reaching Mendelian implications the more terrible it becomes. Can not the fact be that though we may argue for it we do not really *see* it? That with persistent optimism we hope for the best, trust that Junior will inherit grandfather's sense

of humor but somehow miss grandmother's parsimoniousness? Yet if we were to weigh his chances fairly, not forgetting that more remote progenitor who smuggled slaves . . .

Perhaps we shall be spared such calculations for ever, for the biologists seem to be agreeing with the Behaviorists that evidence for inheritance of mental abilities is woefully inadequate. Dr. Raymond Pearl took time off from his fruit flies to check famous biographies in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and reported that of sixty-three noted philosophers only two had fathers sufficiently distinguished to leave public record of that fact; one mother was recorded for posterity. In the next generation results were no better; only sixteen of the sixty-three philosophers had legitimate children, and of these sixteen only five produced children either gifted or distinguished. Only three of the five had children of sufficient fame to appear separately in the encyclopedia. The remaining offspring were either undistinguished or specifically described as "dull and fatuous."

A similar summary of famous poets resulted in like conclusions. An earlier investigator* found that a hundred eminent English judges averaged only nine and one-tenth fathers of any degree of eminence whatever, and produced only twelve and six-tenths sons of any eminence.

In other words, as Doctor Pearl points out in quoting Galton's figures, nine times as many distinguished men were produced by mediocre people as were produced by eminent people. He concludes:

"Certainly modern genetics gives no support to the view that the somatic characteristics of the offspring can be predicted from a knowledge of the somatic characters of the parents. In preaching as they do, that like produces like, and that therefore superior people will have superior children, and inferior people inferior children, the orthodox eugenists are going contrary to the best established facts of genetical science, and are, in the long run, doing their cause harm."[†]

*Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius*.

†"The Biology of Superiority," *American Mercury*, November, 1927.

SUFFER, LITTLE CHILDREN

The general conclusion seems to be the same one reached in the practical American saying of shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves in three generations, or the poetical observation that heirs of great men all remind us we can't make our sons sublime. Yet the hope of accurate self-perpetuation persists among ordinary human beings, who are, of course, not ordinary to themselves. Just as we noticed that insistence on quantity was based on a fear of race extinction, so the insistence on inherited quality is based on fear of the extinction of that ability which each individual, however unsuccessful, sees in himself. Blindly we trust that our successor will succeed where we have failed, will somehow be able to twist things, to trick the hard fate that has beaten us and seize the prize that we have missed. If we live long enough to see him fail we plan marriage for him in order to hope once more in our grandchildren.

Governments tried it before us. Before kings went out of fashion the same fear of an end and the same desperate hope made ministers arrange royal weddings as carefully as stock-breeders mix strains, until it came to seem rather an indecent thing to be a royalty. The "orthodox eugenics" which Doctor Pearl condemns—eugenics under dreadful handicaps, but as well managed as possible under the circumstances—had a long test in palaces if not in cottages. And the test was unsuccessful, else we should all be living happily under a benevolent despotism, always the best imaginable form of government if there were only some way of insuring a succession of benevolent despots.

Unfortunately the fact most firmly established by experiment is that accurate insurance is impossible. The eugenicist's hindsight is better than his foresight; when we ask him for certainties he offers us odds.

When great men do have great sons there is too easy an explanation in the elder's greatness having exerted itself to some extent in the training of his successor. The son of a famous man will have other advantages of situation, too, which may serve to make an ordinary character appear lustrous to the public.

This is to say that it is difficult for the eugenist to eliminate environment from his calculations. We may answer the popular lawgiver who asks, "Do you know that it is nearly fifty times as advantageous to have a preacher for a father as it is to have an unskilled day-laborer?"* with more enthusiastic agreement perhaps from the standpoint of environment than from that of heredity. Heretics nowadays might consider inheritance from a preaching parent of doubtful value, but the chances are that the preacher's house will contain some books, enough food and a literate mother, thus providing better than average surroundings.

To deny the blessings of heredity is, of course, not to deny that the world moves forward. As general knowledge increases it is inevitable that succeeding generations should profit. But the fact is that we often see more progress in the conscious life of an individual than between two or more generations. Just as an example, early in his career we find my grandfather advocating Nietzschean eugenics; this stand is in plain evidence in his comments on my parents' marriage. But he had evidently pondered on the uncertainty of human generation before he made the celebrated retort about "your brains and my body" to Isadora Duncan, and finally in *Back to Methuselah* he comes all the way to conscious evolution. Many a family of conservative tradition has seen less change from grandsire to grandson.

And the most serious quarrel with the heredity principle is that it limits individual accomplishment. It makes little difference if, according to Behaviorist views, the sin of the fathers visited upon the children is due not to actual heredity but to belief in heredity, fond insistence that the child shall conform to expectations. The point is that the sin *is* visited, the cards are stacked.

For we have found no way to take the good of heredity without the evil. If we insist upon developing our own peculiar virtues in our offspring we must look as well for our vices, and then, according to Mendelian law, not only our vices but those of our parents, grandparents and all the assorted ancestry. No one has

*Albert Edward Wiggam, *The Fruit of the Family Tree*, p. 177.

learned just how far back the thing may be carried, and when we learn we shall not have discovered how to eliminate inheritance from say, a great-grandparental rogue or dullard. Certainly if we make life a matter of mixing human blood as you would mix liquids in a test-tube a sense of responsibility will end by making us slaves to our grandchildren, exactly as by the same theory we are slaves to our grandparents.

As for the boast that "there were no rogues in *our* family," though we may trace our pedigrees back to William the Conqueror arithmetic discloses that by the time we've got there some forty million other ancestors must enter our calculations with him. When you've looked squarely at the felons, murderers, lunatics and other oddities to be found in the remote branches of every family tree there's comfort in the Behaviorist's "undying respect for what we can do with that squirming mass of protoplasm we call the human infant."*

Whether we go as far as this or not the tremendous advantage of environment as an influence is that it can be controlled. Surroundings can be taken or left. And until theories of inheritance are proved reliable it would seem the intelligent course to concentrate our efforts on what we can unquestionably manage.

You as an intelligent man will not, I trust, regret the effort to deprive you of the pride of creation. After all, you know, it is only a case of robbing your ninety-eight-cent body to give more power to your invaluable mind. It is giving you conscious ability to influence your children, instead of putting them at the mercy of material circumstances. It is, to put it plainly, letting them develop under your eyes instead of inside the maternal body where you can't do anything for them.

And since you are an intelligent man I can say to you with confidence that I feel sure your children will be remarkably nice children, and bright like their father, whereas under the best eugenic theories I should have had to inquire into the character of your parents and grandparents for several generations.

*John B. Watson, *The Ways of Behaviorism*.

However, I do not think we shall get at the whole truth until we admit that while we do not rightfully create small images of ourselves we do normally attract to ourselves from the still uncharted universe, as in the known world, fairly congenial souls. Indeed, the very word congenial is rooted in such an assumption. And it seems to me a far more reasonable assumption than either the bland theory that we can perpetuate ourselves by physical action or the only slightly less conceited notion that we can develop what character we will in the Behaviorist's "squirming mass of protoplasm."

Both these theories seem to make the child too much a manufactured product. We saw in considering the accounts proposed by science for your existence that both the Behaviorist and the hereditary schools failed adequately to account for your individuality, and this failure seems likely to persist unto the third and fourth generation. There is undoubtedly a connection between the individual and his family. But can not our whole mistake be in making it a causal connection?

Not only are children people, I would not even hesitate to say that often they seem to have been people for a long time, much longer than either the eugenicist or the Behaviorist will allow. I see no reason why we should feel aversion to the idea that, if life is a school, there may be other classes from which newcomers to our own are recruited. Such a theory offers, as far as I know, the only explanation for the apparent injustice which gives to one child every advantage of birth and environment, while handicapping another with a hopeless heredity and surroundings to correspond. No future life could compensate for some conditions, but past lives and continued characters might account for them. There are, for example, those people who thrive on opposition and so must be eternal exceptions to the rule of congeniality. . . .

But there would be no end to that line of speculation, and you may remember that I undertook to guide you to marriage or celibacy, not to parenthood. The one thing to gather from all this

is that you need not be such a slave to duty as to feel obliged to carry on either your own perfections or those of your family; nor, having decided of your own free will to marry, need you choose a wife with biologic aims the primary consideration as, if you were a conscientious eugenicist, you would be obliged to do.

With regard to the third theory of congeniality you surely need have no fears if you have used your intelligence in contracting a romantic marriage.

75

MODERN IMPROVEMENTS

WHENEVER a practical reform is made we have a chorus of passionate protest from those who believe in sacrificing themselves and all reason to an ideal, even an outworn ideal which was at best a "compensation" for a painful condition. Often, too, among the irrational idealists we find more endearing personalities, more sentimentally appealing arguments, than among the plodding and inarticulate practitioners of a new common sense.

But most of the arguments against birth control are singularly inept. The primitive assumption that procreation is a duty to be exercised to the fullest possible extent is easily reduced to the ridiculous. But it is difficult to see how any one could be long misled by another favorite plea: "I was the fifth [or seventh] child. If my parents had practised birth control I shouldn't be here!"

If we are to be egotists at least let us be effective egotists. Instead of saying coldly "What of it?" to the plaintive fifth (or seventh) we may as well ask more politely, "How are you going to prove that if your parents hadn't wanted another child you wouldn't have been born next door?" For to either the religious or the modern individualistic mind the assumption that actual existence can be determined by parental notions is simply the idea of heredity carried to its ultimate absurdity, affecting not merely character but life itself.

And when we get into questions of hypothetical births we

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

have deserted reason for fantasy. If we are to count how many famous people would have been missing if small families had earlier become the fashion, we might as well sigh for what geniuses we might have had if the families of twelve had only been families of fifteen.

More understandable perhaps is the argument of the idealist who insists that the proper method of birth control is self-control, and condemns the use of contraceptives as an incentive to self-indulgence. But we have come to distrust all arguments based on physical threats; we have given up hell fire as a persuasion. The most the idealist can hope for, I think, is that a still more finely sensitized and complicated world of the future will view contraceptives with the distaste now felt for the ancient resort to emetics after overeating. The ultimate aim of taste, certainly, will be that proportion in all things which eliminates waste; as my grandfather's mind reached, in *Back to Methuselah*, a world where food consumption was so adjusted as to make other unattractive physical processes unnecessary and unthinkable.

But if we look too far beyond the horizon there is always a chance of falling over our own feet, and it is useless to burden with the higher calculus minds still learning multiplication. The present fact is that whether or not contraceptives "shall be" used is a dead issue. In one investigation* eighty-seven out of a hundred women used them; in another, seventy-four and eleven hundredths per cent. of a thousand.† Along with kitchen stoves and soaps they are advertised in the leading women's magazines; booklets giving directions for their use are "mailed in a plain envelope," and it is merely necessary to choose between the assurance that only a poison can kill germs and the offer of an antiseptic so safe it can be swallowed by the children, if any.

It is a tenet of modern philosophy that it is the production of children rather than non-productive adult habits with which society has the right to interfere, and the present social trend is

*Doctor Hamilton's *A Research in Marriage*.

†Katharine B. Davis, "A Study of the Sex Life of the Normal Married Woman," *Journal of Social Hygiene*, April, 1922.

as much toward prohibition of large families as toward a tax on childlessness. Yet the latter plan will soon be necessary unless we are to accept childlessness as the normal state for large numbers of people.

Propaganda to popularize parenthood among the intellectual or "superior" classes by advertising it almost as attractively as motor-cars is not apparently very successful. When even the eugenists assure us that though we may be superior we can not guarantee the same superiority for our offspring; when Behaviorists warn us that hardly by prayer or tears can we bring up our own children properly, moral obligations may be said to vanish.

Even modernists who want to become parents "for the experience" are apt to confine their ambition to a single child. All the fuss over parenthood in *Strange Interlude* was allayed with the advent of one baby—hardly a beginning to our ancestors. And if the theories of heredity and environment seem inadequate to explain individuality there seems after all something just a little out of perspective in the theory of children as an experience. I believe the absurdity of the common inquiry: "Do you like children?" must be patent to any person of intelligence. Even dogs have enough individuality to justify the answer, "Well, I like airedales, but I detest chows."

When we admit the rights of even the youngest personality we admit also that human creation amounts to no more than the building of houses—the furnishing of more or less perfect physical bodies as habitations for individual beings. When you put it on this basis it may be a consolation to remember that nowadays the home manufacture of many useful articles has gone out without serious loss. Our former assumption that everything from bread to neckties was best when produced by fond feminine fingers and that every normal woman was naturally possessed of the ability to manufacture a wide range of articles has been succeeded by a different idea. Why should we shed tears over the passing of the view that every home should produce its own children and that every woman is divinely qualified for their production?

A better idea might be to concern ourselves with the leaks in our present system of lavishness with life; if we are to be concerned with its destruction in the germ we should be more deeply concerned over later destruction. Yet even to-day in civilized commonwealths we hang or electrocute individuals who seem to us dangerous to keep among us, and we put thousands more of them in cages as if they were wild animals. Eugenists would say that *their* parents at least should have used birth control; the Behaviorist tells us more helpfully that the criminal is merely a failure in the school of life. But current pedagogy points out that in the perfectly adjusted school there are no failures, and their presence implies a reproach to the institution.

Moreover, in ordinary teaching we have discovered that the best results are obtained in small classes. We can only be encouraged then when families, the primary division in the school of life, reduce their numbers.

The most interesting aspect of birth control to the intelligent observer must be its promise of further developments in control of genetics. For once nothing was surer than that impregnation could not be arrested except by dangerous and even murderous means.

Perhaps other certainties will some day be reduced to like absurdities. At least we have established the principle that nature is neither an enemy nor a friend but a provider of raw material, to be intelligently adapted to our needs, and we have begun to learn that as much judgment may be exercised in elimination as in cultivation.

ONE of the best moral arguments for the large family was that it encouraged unselfishness in both parents and children. Regard for other people, especially the young and helpless of the human race, is always a sign of real intelligence, and the old-fashioned test of fondness for children in the prospective wife or husband had its value. Nevertheless, we can

hardly go as far as the old-fashioned moralist who assures us that children are the salvation of marriage, forgetting that on the other hand he has made children its object. Admission that we must have children in order to save marriage is surely an admission that marriage is more important than children.

Wide-awake people simply feel the importance of children as a link with the growing world. What has been said of the incompatibility of youth and age does not apply to the young in spirit, and interested association with youth is the obvious way to keep young. Without consciously reasoning why, most of us feel a certain sympathy with the ten-year-old who begged to go to the pet-shop instead of the toy-shop because it was nice to have something little and live to love.

But how exactly are we to satisfy this unselfish and human requirement in a modern world which makes marriage uncertain and children after marriage more uncertain still?

As usual, the first step is to decide on our requirements. Just how many children do we want?

In discussing birth control I mentioned that modern educational methods had been found to work best with a small group, but I did not say how small a group. Opinions will differ, but from my own point of view not less than four children, all as nearly as possible of the same age, would constitute the ideal family. Children should grow up with other children; it is an axiom of modern education that association with mankind, like French and swimming, should be taught young. The minimum group of four should be evenly divided as to sex, since sex differences would be discouraged by having the group mixed but not by having only one representative of either sex. The advantages of such early association in minimizing sex consciousness has been shown in the proof by psychological tests of what common sense suggests, that men who grow up with sisters use the best judgment in choosing wives.

Let us leave the economic difficulties to my grandfather and see if we can find a way for you to manage, even with birth

control and the best of luck, a family of the right age and sex assortment. Must one wait until science discovers the secret of sex determination, and then pray for quadruplets?

The fact is, I believe, that a suggestion of my grandfather's will solve the biological problem too. In *Major Barbara*, between preoccupations with Socialism and the Salvation Army, he took time to point out the path of safe succession through the adoption of foundlings. Amending the suggestion to permit the adoption of any orphans, as indeed that old bluffer Undershaft was forced to amend it, I can think of no better solution to the problem of a made-to-order family.

Of course other philosophers have long suggested, in a general way, the same theory. It is hard to find a clearer description than that of Confucius, who declared that in a state of advanced civilization, which he termed the Great Similarity, "Men do not regard as their parents only their own parents, nor treat as their own children only their own children." Admitting that this conception of existence had not been realized, he added:

"Now that the Great Principle has not yet been developed, the world is inherited through family. Each one regards as his parents only his own parents, and treats as his children only his own children. The wealth of each and his labor are only for his self-interest. Great men imagine it is the rule that their estates should descend in their own families. Their object is to make the walls of their cities and suburbs strong and their ditches and moats secure. . . . Thus it is that selfish schemes and enterprises are constantly taking their rise, and war is inevitably forthcoming. . . . This is the stage of what I call the Small Tranquillity."*

This obviously is the stage with which we are only too familiar. But Confucius assures us that the state of the Great Similarity will be otherwise; for then, regarding all children as their own,

**Li Ki*, Book VII, sect. 1, 2, 3. Trans. by Dr. Chen Huan Chang in *The Economic Principles of Confucius and His School*.

CUSTOM-MADE FAMILIES

"Each man has his rights, and each woman her individuality safe-guarded. They produce wealth, disliking that it should be thrown away upon the ground, but not wishing to keep it for their own gratification. Disliking idleness, they labor, but not alone with a view to their own advantage. In this way selfish schemings are repressed and find no way to arise. Robbers, filchers and rebellious traitors do not exist. Hence the outer doors remain open, and are not shut."

You observe that by the simple process of regarding all mankind as related Confucius derives those benefits which my grandfather sets forth as resulting from equality of income. No doubt it is true that from a Confucian or even a Christian standpoint the family as we know it is as outworn an institution as capitalism in its worst state, both indeed being based on heredity.

But the moment you admit the philosophical obligation to see the world as one family you have admitted the advisability of applying in the world at large the same consideration you would give your own children. Here the matter of adoption enters again. Until population is evenly distributed birth control below the ideal number of children per family will be necessary in order to take care of the strays. If the world is one family we can not add indiscriminately to the family group as long as there are members for whom we are failing satisfactorily to provide.

And according to the children's bureau of the United States Department of Labor there are in the world to-day more dependent children—meaning children dependent on public instead of private care—than ever before since records have been kept by social agencies.

From the old point of view the insurmountable objection to securing a human background for orphans was the question of heredity. This, however, is the objection at which the Behaviorist levels a telling blow when he intimates that given a choice between being born a Jukes and brought up an Edwards, or being born an Edwards and brought up a Jukes, he'd have to choose the former.

There is still the family-name sentiment; some men, I under-

stand, have qualms about giving their names to any save their own children. On this point I am not, I admit, qualified to argue; for women are early accustomed, except in Spanish-speaking countries, to the idea that they can not expect to hand on their names. When you are used to it you do not mind.

Much of the remaining prejudice against adoption, aside from the great heredity prejudice, comes perhaps from the fact that in times not far distant a great deal of involuntary adoption was practised. That is, in the progressive polygamy (sanctified by properly spaced funerals) which we saw in a previous chapter to be the frequent practise of our grandparents, there were necessarily a great many left-over families. Try to untangle the stepbrothers and half-sisters and steppaunts and so on in one of those small towns which survive among us as microcosms of the nineteenth century, and you will see what I mean.

In *The Women of Tomorrow*, William Hard presents this situation plainly as shown by the records of American universities. Of eleven graduates of the Harvard class of 1671, Mr. Hard discovered that one died a bachelor—at twenty-four. Of the remaining ten four were married twice and two were married three times. For ten husbands there were eighteen wives. They had 71 children, 21 of whom died in infancy, which left an average of 5 surviving children for each of the 10 fathers, but only 2.7 for each of the 18 mothers. In other words 2.3 of the children out of every 5 were “adopted” by their fathers’ second or third wives.

To avoid partiality Mr. Hard also quotes New Haven records. Between 1701 and 1745, 418 Yale husbands lost 147 wives before they—the wives—reached middle age. The records run like this: “First wife died at 24, leaving 6 children.” Or at 19, leaving 3. “14 children; first wife died at 28, having borne 8 children in 10 years.” In those days they had their orphanages at home.

Yet these children who were married along with their parents must often have been unwanted. On the one hand jealousy, on the other hand loyalty to a dead parent surely proved enough to

ALL GOD'S CHILLUN

breed the hate that survives in the "cruel stepmother" legend as well as in the legend that no other child is quite like one's own.

An attitude better adapted to intelligence is surely that of the little girl who, when her playmates accused her of being an adopted child, said proudly, "You bet I am. My parents didn't just take what any old doctor brought; they picked me out of a whole orphanage!"

If you are competent to manage the all-important task of choosing a wife, it seems reasonable to suppose that you might trust your combined intelligence in the choice of a child. The orphanage, unlike the hospital, will make no errors in sex nor will it require a large initial expenditure of time, energy and money in addition to the cost of upkeep.

In choosing your children you put the whole question of relationship squarely on a selective basis. And haven't you always wished you could choose your own relatives?

77

ALL GOD'S CHILLUN

IF a steady though slowly growing interest in the welfare of stray children were not sufficient proof, there is another indication that the spread of common sense about procreation brings no danger that the child mind will perish from the earth. We shall keep it even to the extent of preserving it in ourselves, for while we are having fewer children we are considering how to regain and retain the child's care-free point of view.

How else shall we explain what observers of our folkways call the new spirit of play? How else account for grandmother's skittish skirts and grandfather's plus-fours? We are determined not to lose the good things of childhood; we are resurrecting or, if younger, clinging to our love of color and of the ridiculous, our informal comfort. Even a certain amount of happy irresponsibility we think is good for us. Perhaps the development of radio and aerial transport will preserve for us also our childish

belief that all things are possible. And we have built skyscrapers to dwarf our grown-up stature as the barn dwarfs a small boy's, thus keeping for ourselves a healthy childish realization of our own inconsiderability.

Of course no intelligent person aspires to be what is called young in the head. Though they may think clearly enough, children are limited by their lack of data as a reliable basis of thought, and this young near-sightedness and preoccupation with the physical universe combined with sensitive concentration often does make childhood the most miserable age. It isn't all pleasure unalloyed. If we wriggled our toes in ecstasy on Christmas Eve because we hoped Santa Claus would bring us a particular toy, we were desolate if he didn't and defenseless if it broke. If we caught glimpses of heaven while we absorbed candy, we caught glimpses of another place when we had eaten too much.

But the strange and valuable thing about the child mind is that in the midst of its limitations it is without limitation, feels neither lack nor fear when confronted with the eternal emergency of the new thing, only sets out cheerfully to slay the Jabberwock and succeeds if there is any virtue in faith. All things are possible to children; they have not circumscribed the universe and said, "Thus far and no farther" to their own hopes. They know they can still learn, and they want to learn. They do not come to a satisfied dead stop.

This brings up what may in time prove a very interesting point. We all know the saddening results of the Army Intelligence Tests, but not all of us recognized at once one significance of the figures. As one biologist puts it:

" . . . It seems likely that the age of puberty is the time when the inhibitory factors begin to work. We have all been amazed and some of us have been scandalized at the results of the Army Intelligence Tests. Yet it is quite apparent that they show the average mental age of the American male to be the same as his age of puberty. Arguments enough, most of them somewhat acrid, have been based on the possible mental inferiority of

RESULTS ABROAD

women. If real, this inferiority means simply a lower mental age—and women arrive at puberty two years earlier than men.”*

Similar mention of the arrest of mental development at puberty is made by Havelock Ellis in *Man and Woman*, which quotes Lord Wolseley's observation of the African Fantis: "You can apparently teach the boy anything until he reaches puberty, then he becomes gradually duller and more stupid, more lazy, and more useless every day." Most teachers are familiar with the simultaneous development, much nearer than Africa, of mental limitations and sexual preoccupations. For even the most fervent Freudian contents himself with pointing out the presence of sex instincts in childhood; he does not claim that they interfere with the healthy child's activity to the extent that they often interfere in later life. In general it seems that perception of sex can still be regarded as the line of demarcation between childhood and the grown-up world, in which the worst aspects of sex have been appropriately called adultery.

And so, if we are to set ourselves the task of becoming or staying children pragmatically, like Peter Pan, we shall have to cultivate in our own minds some of Peter's detachment, which, you may remember, extended to Wendy's innocent domestic advances as to those of the vampire, Tiger Lily.

78

RESULTS ABROAD

AS we have considered the effects of a diminished, or at least a better-controlled sex interest in the family, let us continue with the possible effects of such control in the world at large.

It is interesting to find a change in sexual emphasis looming large among a scientist's speculations as to the future of society. In his *Possible Worlds* J. B. S. Haldane describes one in which sexual instincts make an annual cycle: "Every year, in the course

*Dr. Emmett Reid Dunn in *American Mercury*, November, 1927.

of a few weeks, we should undergo the profound changes in almost every department of our own mental life which are actually spread over several years of adolescence. . . . Our tastes in art, literature, clothing, politics and religion would suddenly alter. . . . Love, which is a synthesis of sexual passion with friendship arising out of common interests, would be almost impossible, and human life would be a poorer thing in many ways. But in particular it is hard to see how any stable system of moral, political, æsthetic or religious ideas could come into being. And even if the absolute character of the ideas and values appertaining to such branches of human activity be denied, some form of intellectual construction is almost undeniably preferable to raw emotion as a basis for behavior in these spheres. An animal with a breeding season would find little permanent but material objects, and its philosophy would probably be a crude materialism, its conduct regulated by a system of harsh and arbitrary laws rather than by any internal criterion."

A terrible world. And yet . . . and yet . . . is it so strange?

No stable moral, political, esthetic or religious issues. Love almost impossible. A philosophy of crude materialism; conduct regulated only by a code of harsh and arbitrary laws—where have we heard of these things before? Can it be that the writer, in his playful scientific way, means to indicate that we too are animals with a breeding season? To the detached view of a scientist, or an angel, we perhaps differ from the animal of the hypothesis only in averaging but one season to a lifetime.

"As we impose the adult taste in these matters on children, we can only dimly guess at the values of a humanity without sexual interests," Haldane concludes.

In short, we are so used to having sex make the world go round and round that it is hard to imagine how it would feel to go forward. But we can try, and having been so often told that sex prefers darkness to light, it may be easiest to begin with the dark side of life.

IT isn't necessary to read French detective stories to conclude that there is an intimate connection between crime and sex. The tabloids will tell you, and in this perhaps you may believe them. Court dockets at least bear out the tale with murders for lust, thefts for vanity, and other crimes of jealousy and perversion and general sexual insanity. It's unnecessary to emphasize the more lurid exposures when the least knowledge of human nature tells us that shoplifting may be as much a *crime passionnel* as murder.

Certainly, however, we need not make the mistake of thinking that because crimes are traceable to sex they are to be classified by sex. Chastity used to be regarded as feminine morality, honesty as the masculine sort, and true to the ancient definition, women's reformatories are filled by crimes due to sex, men's jails by crimes against the equivalent of Adam's curse—labor or its measure, money; but there is a connection between them. The man arrested for banditry has either a wife and kiddies or a love nest. The woman arrested for soliciting is earning a living. Our needs and our weaknesses aren't so different after all.

With both men and women sex as an immediate excitant to crime is acknowledged to serve in much the same way as alcohol as an excitant to sex interest. "Here's to crime!" may incite to nothing more serious than disregard of the constitution when drunk in alcohol, but the same toast drunk with "but a kiss within the cup" has a deadlier reputation. Why, with this admission general, is there no more effort to control crime at an important source?

The answer is that sex, as usual, retains its hold by means of its more respectable connections, Home and Family.

Oddly enough, it seems that legally these connections may be almost as dangerous because, though they may not incite directly to crime, they foster criminality by befuddling the law. The experienced criminal lawyer asks no better argument than a crape-

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

clad widow or a golden-haired tot, unless, perhaps, it is the babe unborn. Newspapers recently chronicled as fact that the hiring of children for appearances in English police courts was becoming a common practise.

But are we to regard it as no betrayal of justice when jurors respond to a mother's tears or a kiddie's treble cry instead of acting on the facts of the case? To the impartial view it seems that Justice is blindfolded by a swaddling-cloth, and her scales which should represent an equal balance between "masculine" wisdom and "feminine" mercy are so often tipped awry because of the sex consciousness which clears a court-room of women at critical moments after admitting them as a *casus delicti*.

Most flagrant of all of course are the verdicts swayed by s. a. when Roxie Hart crosses her dimpled knees, and it seems unfair that the custom which deprives a male criminal of firearms should permit female prisoners to come into court armed cap-a-pie by the hairdresser, the druggist and the city's best dress and hosiery shops. Real justice would surely give the poor bank robber an opportunity to shoot his way out with his puny weapons.

And shall we whisper nothing of those minor infractions of traffic laws and such, when a lovely little Junior Leaguer bites a soft red lower lip and lifts teary lashes to the judge who knows she didn't mean to do it? If we were only able to outlaw otherwise respectable women's recourse to sex appeal it's fairly safe to say that "Ladies and Lawlessness" would not be linked as alliteratively as they have been by more than one observer.*

But perhaps these abuses have their uses. If brought too often into court sex may eventually lose its prestige with the respectable relations and its appeal to the public if not to the law.

*Specifically by Duncan Aikman in *Harper's*, February, 1929.

IF sex is an excitant to private murder, how about the wholesale public variety? The answer can be found in any text-book which shows food and sex, translated into terms of economics and population, as the root causes of war.

It's true that discussions of war to-day are apt to be just a little hysterical, because of our common knowledge that a sword hangs none too securely suspended over us all. The Damoclean symbol is of course out of date; no one to-day need fear a sword. But we have only to look to see over our heads bomb-carrying airplanes and clouds of poison gas, and though we may trust the enterprise of our country's government to provide for our defense more airplanes and more bombs and poison than neighboring nations can afford, the fact is that national security can not and does not pretend to mean individual security. Your side may win the war, but if you are killed in the meantime it won't much matter to you.

There used to be a great deal said about the end of the world. Scoffers have stood and laughed at the idea; we have all had our share of fun when people sought signs and wonders and a definite date for the proceedings. But between their childish planning and our own laughter the thing has come upon us. When humanity's capacity for destruction exceeds its capacity for renewing life the end of the world is literally at hand.

And that is where we are to-day. We have perfected the science of killing until it is generally admitted that we are alive merely by the sufferance of those who have the power to loose available destructions upon us. We enjoy that sufferance merely because some few lords of this world are sane enough to see that while we can wipe out cities we can not create them except by slow and painful processes, processes which now seem rather futile and silly. To bring children into the world one at a time with blood and tears, only to be killed by the million with the same accompaniment is hardly an employment for intelligent people.

More, unlimited parenthood under such conditions may seem not only fatuous but questionable from the standpoint of world morality. National birth-rates may wane but there is no dearth as yet of world citizens. And since an expanding population is the common excuse of would-be world conquerors it seems only common sense to look with suspicion upon a nation that offers subsidies to propagation, as one displaying the first symptoms of a dangerous disease. The argument of economic necessity, after all, is only the argument of the thief who steals for the sake of his wife and family. Sex again is the *casus belli*:

“War, my lord,
Is of eternal use to human kind,
For ever and anon when you have pass’d
A few dull years in peace and propagation,
The world is overstock’d with fools, and wants
A pestilence at least if not a hero.”

Or, if you prefer the prose of Mr. Havelock Ellis: “For all those among us who have faith in civilization and humanity, and are unable to believe that war can ever be a civilizing or humanizing method of progress, it must be a daily prayer that the fall of the birth-rate may be hastened.”*

No doubt, then, the god of physical love was rightly a man child, the son of Mars and Venus. In the days when man-power was needed for the tribe, man’s logical goal was more warriors, and the baby, Eros, might reasonably be expected to grow up another big strong man like his father. Indeed the three members of that family—Mars, Venus and the baby—stand as perfect models for what philosophers call the natural man. They might, in fact, be termed a sort of Holy Family for the worshipers of manly strength, feminine beauty and childish cuteness. Those of us who in these days are truly weary of Mars may as well be a little wary of Venus too, and even of Cupid if he is never disciplined.

**Essays in Wartime.*

ADAM'S CURSE

It is not hard, aside from the population question as ordinarily viewed, to see how abolition of sex tyranny might make for significant improvement in international and even interracial relations. We are commonly prejudiced against other races because of a basic horror of interbreeding; the Lateran Council which in 1215 conferred the hated yellow badge upon the Jews had as its excuse the prevention of intercourse between Jews and Gentiles of opposite sexes. Nowadays the southern white man will tell you, and mean it, that he has no objection to the Negro—what he can not stand is “social equality.” By this he means simply that he can not bear the thought of his children marrying negroes. With racial taboos becoming more and more impossible and, in this shrinking world, more and more dangerous the only alternative to general interbreeding will be sex control and preference for the complementary marriage with its demand for similarity.

One practical consolation at least remains for those of us who, in any connection, prefer to hear less of sex. War itself seems on the way to losing its sex appeal if that appeal is based on sex difference. No more can the knight in shining armor go forth to defend his lady; not only has he no armor but she can not be defended. Her peril will be greater than his, if, as my grandfather has prophesied, the next war proves fatal to non-combatants in cities and safest for troops in front-line dugouts.

81

ADAM'S CURSE

EVEN if you regard war as a professional soldier does, not as wholesale murder but as legitimate business, it is still a product of sexual slavery; for labor in general is another of the evils to be so classified. Work, you remember, was Adam's curse in correspondence with the curse of Eve.

By work I mean not the joy of achievement but the drudgery of toil, the work my grandfather defined as doing what you don't want to do. As a device for compelling mankind to take up this

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

heavy burden it must be admitted that nothing like a wife and family has so far been invented. The lash of Pharaoh could never accomplish so much. Socialism, as grandfather hopes, by bringing equality of work along with equality of income will enable us all to support ourselves with a few hours' labor each day. But that means radical change in the present sexual arrangement, which does not let you off with self-support; even socialism can not promise that you can earn enough to support several other people without buckling down to it. In this case my grandfather's observation in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* that babies can not be expected to work for themselves but are nevertheless shockingly greedy tallies with the discovery of Mr. Kipling's committee in *An Imperial Rescript* that you can only lighten the curse of Adam by lifting the curse of Eve. This was once considered a sockdolager of an argument against trying to help Adam, but if Eve's sentence is to be suspended by the aid of expert scientific testimony there may be hope in his case too.

As we lose our sex handicaps work should be lessened not merely by a fairer division of labor as women become self-supporting, but by possible advantages to be gained from cooperation. I do not mean that women will revolutionize the working world, any more than they have revolutionized the world of politics. I certainly do not mean to say that women are wonders in business as business is now run, but I do not see how they could be, without being much more unlike men than they are.

To an intelligent woman, I'm afraid, business at its best is just a game and at its worst a humbug. This, I think, is usually the view of the intelligent man. The difference is that the intelligent man is usually at the top and woman at the bottom of the ladder, and the view, while a healthy one for the president of the company, is a poor one for a stenographer just beginning.

Quite properly, since they came late into the commercial world, women have had to start with the fag ends and the dry bones. A fairer complaint of their lot is that though they came tardily in they came not as strangers from another plane, but as

the people who for centuries have been vying with one another to make things comfortable for men. Naturally they are expected, and too often they are willing, to go right on with this mission. Would the average department head expect a man assistant to dust his desk for him? If you joined his staff fresh from college and he expected it of you I'm afraid you'd tell him where to go. But he will readily accept the service from a girl doing the same work because dusting seems a woman's business.

It is women's own fault if their fatal adaptability leads them to do the tasks of the novice capably but indifferently, so that supporters of the theory that brains and executive ability are a matter of sex can pounce on them to prove that "women may be all right in matters of detail but they are lacking in initiative." But it is less a feminine fault than a phase of the transition tangle that women who try to combine business and old-fashioned marriage so often fail at one or the other, perhaps at both.

Even before she takes on the duties of a wife the business girl with this career in view lessens her efficiency, slacking on the work in hand for the sake of the change ahead. But how many men would be keen on their jobs if they were fairly certain that next year they would be doing something entirely different? Would you yourself care about writing ads or selling bonds or building railroads, or whatever it is you are doing or planning to do, if you knew that in a short time you'd probably be concerned instead with cooking spinach and filling bottles with milk and barley water?

"They have no ambition, no desire to get ahead," I once heard an executive complain of his girl employees. "When I was a shop 'prentice I stayed in at noon and overtime at night to learn more about the job than the other fellow. But these girls have no sense of competition. You can't play one against another. All they're thinking about is a good time."

Wherein he was, of course, very wrong. (He was not a very intelligent man.) Their sense of competition, their desire to get ahead, was simply in a different direction. Their competition

was in clothes and dates, their desire to get ahead by marriage—the good old-fashioned ambition of their mothers and grandmothers. For while I have warned you that women are changing and that modern ones do not marry for their meals, there are still a great many old-fashioned girls left.

These, however, are temporary conditions. If women can learn the ropes and at the same time retain enough detachment to see the whole prospect with the clarity of the stranger, they may eventually become effective. It is valuable enough to see business as a game of tag-you're-it with cost sheets, and hide-and-seek with percentages, if you know at the same time exactly what the costs and the percentages are supposed to mean. Most women in their acclimatization will no doubt take on the vices of their predecessors; Miss Brown when promoted to Mr. Jones' job will probably turn out to be vain of her position, jealous of her prerogatives, hard on the office force and generally much like Mr. Jones. But occasionally a woman will arrive at authority without losing the intelligence gained in other lines of endeavor, and then she may contribute something to the humanization of commerce.

Men have already made effective contributions to lessen home work. For the catchwords of "efficiency" and "sound business practise" were only rivaled in tyrannical fatuity by those other two, "handwork" and "homemade." Tidies and antimacassars, like files and reports, were admirably devised to preserve the sanctity of jobs and prevent labor from being reduced to its lowest common denominator. Naturally slaves of the industry are the last to improve it, and so it was a man who invented the vacuum cleaner, the fireless cooker, the electric appliances that have revolutionized housekeeping. And while men in general are accused of conservatism it is to the occupation of masculine artists with household decoration that we owe the enlivening of modern kitchens with crimson coffee-pots and bright blue brooms. My own observation is that men of our generation are apt to discuss furniture and cooking and all the domestic arts with more intelligent interest than most women exhibit.

ADAM'S CURSE

I am not trying to tell you that man's place is in the home. I am merely suggesting that there may be more fun for everybody when we have accustomed ourselves to play in each other's yards. And since you have on the whole been very polite about admitting women into your business premises, it seems only fair to acknowledge that your presence in the kitchen and the laundry and the parlor has brought quite as much order and beauty as that mysterious "touch of a woman's fingers" celebrated by the old-fashioned novelist.

Recently a well-known New Jersey merchant died with the request that "Has Lived and Accomplished Nothing" be made his epitaph. Only three years before his death he had been the subject of one of those "How I Succeeded" interviews. Now inquiring reporters discovered that it was his wife, all the time, who had run the business; as his widow she would continue it as usual. But she told the truth with tears in her eyes. Her husband had liked to invent things, potter around the house, read a little, and play with the children. He hadn't had any head for business, but it wasn't fair to say he'd accomplished nothing. "He made the home happy," she said.

Here you see a sensible arrangement had been worked out, but the public belief that a man's place is in business instead of at home, whatever his talents, had branded an otherwise successful man a failure in his own eyes. It is not always the man who suffers; sometimes a woman with the family supply of business sense has to see property mismanaged and is lucky to salvage anything from the wreck. One wonders how many business and marital failures could be traced to this curious assumption that tasks must be so divided.

In short, the legend, if you will let me call it a legend, of man's peculiar aptitude for business seems equaled if not surpassed by the colossal proportions of the legend of woman's natural fitness for the job of homemaking. It has been her job just as business has been man's job, but neither can be said to have been a conspicuous success at anything save multiplying work.

YOU see, I am determined to blame sex for a great many of the evils which my grandfather attributes to capitalism. And if the evils of crime, war and hard labor are traceable even in part to sexual slavery as we know it we have, it would seem, sufficient arguments against the present system. But they are negative arguments, and negative arguments are never as valuable as positive ones. If it is essential to wisdom to perceive the faults in our present system it is still wise to make sure of benefits in any new system before adopting it.

At first glance the benefits accruing from diminished and even vanished emphasis on sex are almost too numerous to mention. Consider how much kinder we could all be to one another if sexual distrust were abolished; how much our manners would improve if we could follow our merely decent impulses without fear of having them regarded as sentimental advances. Consider how much more intelligent we might become if our minds were devoted to other problems than those of sex; how even our humor would improve if the most ancient of jokes could be made generally pointless.

The social benefits would be immense. Please do not judge them by present difficulties, which are due to transition instead of achievement of the end. Just as we have the economic situation aggravated by strikes and lockouts in the final struggles of capitalism, so we have promiscuity and sex antagonism and bad manners generally to mark the last days of sexual tyranny. No revolution is pleasant while it is going on.

So now when I talk about the benefits of a sex-exempt society you may think ruefully of some of your own experiences and doubt the advantages. You may have been harassed by girls who, in discarding feminine modesty of approach, seemed to force upon you the alternatives of acceding to all their wishes or deserting your own good manners. You may have relied hopefully on the modern woman's broadmindedness to extend your

278

NICE PEOPLE

friendship to other women, only to have her turn and rend you in a spirit of ancient possessiveness. Yet the trouble, you see, is not with the efforts toward improvement but with the conflict between these efforts and old ideas of chivalry and personal property. Once we are firmly established on a new basis we shall have the fruits of victory.

To be sure, we'd better not make the mistake of planting ourselves on any basis, and perhaps I should have said "as soon as we all begin to move." For it is only the idea of motion in a certain direction that we need to give us a common understanding. Never, perhaps, will all humanity be equal; our nearest approach to equality is in moving together. Some people may march at the head of the column and some in the rear rank, and we shall do very well as long as we all keep going. Our difficulty comes when the front rankers stop and begin marking time in happy complacency because they are ahead. That does indeed hold up the whole procession.

To bring it down to practical application, there is almost no point of sympathetic human contact between a Sadie Thompson and a woman who is decently and correctly married according to the Victorian tradition. But there may be sympathy of a sort between Sadie and a modern woman who is trying to improve her own ideas of sexual ethics, because each has a struggle with a common enemy. There may also be—what with the modern admission of feminine mortality—sympathy between men and women engaged in the same struggle against instinct, and indeed it is hard not to believe that the best hope for success lies in such mutual warfare. Together we fall and together we shall have to stand.

Social toleration, in short, in these days of change depends on having higher ambitions of one's own. Climbers are fellow travelers no matter what their respective heights; it is only when we stand smugly on a flat moral plateau that we can look down with disdain upon the strugglers beneath.

Another reason why social relationships might be pleasanter

in the world we contemplate is that with sex differences forgotten we should lose some of the irritability that is based on an inner sense of shame.

Shamelessness, while an appealing characteristic of the child mind, can hardly be recommended as long as there is any cause for shame. Practical moderns who refuse to connect shame with sex on the ground that sex is merely a physical characteristic are right as far as they go. But we have already seen that belief in the importance of sex is connected with crimes concerning which shame is quite in order.

The difficulty is that it is not only the criminal who feels shame in a society where sex consciousness and self-consciousness go hand in hand, dragging ill temper with them. Realization of personal imperfection and the attempt to hide it we count inseparable from human life as we know it. And sex contributes a large share to this chief misery of mortals.

When we are children we are happy with our parents because we have no concealments from them. As we grow older and develop thoughts which we blush to confess to what our youth sees as their innocence, that happiness is destroyed. We are then happiest perhaps with those of our own sex with whom concealments are fewest, and so we have girls vowing undying friendship and men boasting of a love for one another which passeth the love of women. Fortunately for the progress of the world out of sexual divisions this does not last, but is followed by those glimpses of heaven which we sometimes have in love when agonizing misunderstandings are over and before new ones are begun.

Marriage brings, or should bring, release from shame where one person is concerned, and when marriage does result in peace and happiness no small factor in its success must be the relief we all experience in laying aside the concealment we are forced to practise with the world. But heaven help those who marry without effectively bridging the gulf of sex difference; it is difficult to imagine greater discomfort than intimate life with one

from whom there must be concealment. The essential truth in *The Great God Brown* seems to be that the hero finds his mask uncomfortable at all times but intolerable when he must assume it for his wife.

In mentioning marriage again I am not wandering from the subject of social improvements, since we hear enough nowadays of the evils of divorce to appreciate the advantages to society of permanent marriages. It would, indeed, be a social relief to hear less of parallels that can never meet and triangles with heart-piercing points, and if marriages based on other than sex attraction will prove more permanent we may count this among the social gains. As the whole idea of romantic marriage is permanence I have said little about it, but it may surely be taken for granted when the marriage is successful. At least, since it is physical attraction which wanes with time, those who marry for other reasons can console each other with the knowledge that this was inevitable and that neither was to blame. My grandfather made a great deal of the opportunity, in a world enjoying equality of income, to marry without any consideration of difference in station. I believe, if grandfather will excuse my saying so, that more heartbreaks have been due to differences in sexual training.

GREATEST of all the advantages will be, without a doubt, the advantages to society of individual freedom. I do not claim originality for the discovery that all the worth-while things in the world, for the world, have been done by people who were able to disregard the claims of sexual necessity. Grandfather in one (or even more) of his Prefaces said it first. But count for yourself. Columbus sailed away from home and family to find a new world as explorers had done before him and have done since, and none of them, Phœnicians or Norsemen or Spaniards or Dutch, or our own Polar travelers, took along their wives and children. All the things that are real

fun, like travel and physical danger and rash utterances, demand a singleness of mind; they can not be complicated by any ordinary form of conjugality.

"For the wife and kiddies" a man will work fingers to the bone and brain to dullness; will swallow injuries and insult; will lie and steal and cheat his best friend and even commit murder; but he will not risk his life making great discoveries, or his neck breaking world's records, or his reputation stating unpopular truths. These tasks fall to individuals who do them as individuals; who, while they may have families as attachments, have been able to keep the attachment loose. An explorer or a reformer is no more an ideal husband judged by the ordinary standards than Joan of Arc, judged by those same standards, would have been an ideal wife.

And yet it is the explorers, the reformers and the Joans who stand out from the drab pages of history with a promise of what life might be if we all had the courage to put the world of the present ahead of the world of the future and assume our own burdens, concerning ourselves with what we can do now rather than with what posterity may possibly perform.

The recasting of our social code is, however, one task that is not for lone individuals to accomplish. This is a thing which men and women must do together, and it may prove a precedent for doing other things the same way. It is sexual differences, after all, and economic handicaps due to these differences which make it necessary for the hero to be a bachelor or a widower. If wives were not a handicap they might perhaps go along and find the new world too.

For we have done things together, and when all is said and done we have probably done more together—though the total of our accomplishment is less—than the celibate explorers. Together we have followed the explorer's trail almost as soon as he made it, conquering wildernesses and building houses. We have balanced budgets, and seen Tommy through the measles, and buried little Susie. It is simply that all these accomplish-

ments of ours have amounted to nothing but existing. And if, in the childhood of the world, our best work was carrying on physical existence, as a young child's whole duty is simply being and growing physically, this is no longer the case. We have, surely, come to the stage where we can crawl about and say ga-ga; and the time for our coeducation is at hand. If we remain longer content with mere existence we shall stand the idiot's chance of losing life itself.

Not only for our safety—imperiled by the fact that we have learned to command forces which we are as yet unfit to control—but for our enjoyment of life, it is time we stopped being satisfied with the fact of continued breathing and took an interest in the possibilities of the universe. To confine ourselves indefinitely to the Home and the Family is to keep ourselves in the cradle. We may go on as before, doing our best through good intentions, but love and our best efforts can not indefinitely be understood as physical love and babies, even Better Babies. Pioneers who resign responsibility for keeping the world going and devote themselves to making it better must do so in the faith that their minds and their bodies will become adjusted to the new condition; that their refusal to employ unsatisfactory faculties will result in eventual development of faculties of greater value.

One of the first compensations should be the understanding we now find only on those occasions when, absorbed for a moment by a mutual interest, we forget sex in life that is bigger than anything sex can create. Further compensation we do not need to see at once; the man-animal who first stood erect saw, probably, no clear vision of a West Point graduating class. He simply found it desirable to walk, one step at a time, on two feet instead of on four.

As for ways and means the child mind, if we can only look at it without sentiment, may prove extremely helpful. Peter and Wendy, sentiment aside, showed good Scotch sense in living the simple life, having fairy servants and adopting lost boys. Peter, if he is as he says "a bird that has burst from the egg," is the

first happy hero of romance to substitute for the triumph of the egg triumphant flight of his own. Perhaps he deserves his name; perhaps he knows and handles, as effectively as his pipes, the keys of heaven.

84

KINGDOM COME

LIGHT talk of a romantic heaven is as far as most of us dare or care to go. We have considered religion as a possible aid in finding happiness, not as a duty, and if we think about such matters further we will be apt to feel that results which are satisfactory to ourselves and to society will not require further scrutiny.

Yet as we began with romance and continued with science it may be proper, as we approach the end, to think once more of religion; remembering that by many intelligent men both the selfish and the social satisfactions of this world have been considered only as shadows of the world to come. To their minds, when I mention the keys of heaven, might occur another tune—

“All folks talk 'bout heab'n ain' gwine there”—

and a doubt of our direction.

I realize, indeed, that I have not given any very specific directions. This is partly because, in these days of reckless acting but cautious thinking, any conclusion must be hedged about with so many ifs, ands and buts as to be well-nigh invisible. But I warned you in the beginning that this was not a reform treatise, and as a romanticist I refuse to apologize for failing to outline any definite plan, for urging upon you not a course of action but a point of view. To a romanticist, you see, the point of view is what matters. When I have said all that I have felt compelled to say against the present system I still must consider, at last, both marriage and celibacy as parallel roads to a romantic goal which is also a religious goal, being happiness or the hope of heaven ahead.

But since the way of looking at things is so important let us

by all means consider the effect of lessened emphasis on sex in terms of our immortal souls.

In the early discussion of religion I drew the obvious conclusion that while we had examples of Christian warrant for marital relations and Christian love for children it was hard to find any Christian insistence on parenthood as a duty, and marriage for that purpose alone was plainly discouraged. I shall now add the suggestion that from one interpretation of Christian teachings insistence upon the importance of human parenthood may stand squarely in the way of that perception of eternal life which is the religious hope.

Considering once more the matter of the wine of Cana, it may perhaps be significant that the water was so glorified, as later bread was multiplied, by one who had previously thirsted and fasted. In short, the Christian miracle was preceded by self-denial in the direction of the miracle, exactly as the scientific miracle with which we are more familiar demands a definite amount of self-control.

Christian self-denial has not, of course, been represented as a method, but as a duty. It is possible, however, that if such denial were accompanied by positive results it would assume the appearance not of a sacrifice but of a smart trade. Certainly if we really saw cause and effect in the statement "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again" we should forget pity for the crucified in envy of the resurrection.

But what would be a denial in the direction of eternal life? A denial, that is, which would affirm faith in the actual possibility of achieving eternal life?

It might be a denial of the need to renew life.

Obviously any teaching which has to do with resurrection, reincarnation or any form of conscious survival must imply the unimportance of the body of this life, or as Saint Paul would say, the body of this death. If man's existence is eternal only the insignificant bodily garment can be at the mercy of sexual expression on the part of two persons thinking only of them-

selves. It is difficult enough to assign to such a cause the complexities of human character; how much less convincingly does it account for the immortality of the divine image.

But the orthodox account of Christ's appearing offers difficulties enough to any Christian who wishes to argue for the necessity of sex as a creative measure. The Virgin Birth perhaps of all the miracles affords the clearest illustration of conflict between naturalistic theology, natural science and impartial religious philosophy. The simple theologian who bases his belief in the incarnation on a materialization of Divinity is, of course, exactly on the level of the classical pagan who lent credence to the legend of Leda and the swan, or the savage who believed any of the tales of God-begotten beings hung by Frazer on the Golden Bough. On the other hand, the natural scientist who denies the possibility of human birth without human impregnation is worshiping his own deity with no less fervor. One credits the Creator with phallic propensities; the other makes the phallus his Creator.

The philosopher at the third point of the triangle is uninterested in physical phenomena except as the surface indication of mental action. Failing always to find a primary cause in matter, he finds it logically possible to believe that the intelligence which presumably evolved generic man is quite capable of evolving or perpetuating an individual specimen without human assistance, and so it is no more difficult for him to accept the divine origin of Christ and Buddha upon earth than to account for the origin, merely further removed, of the spirit of man.

The high-handed carelessness of the early Christians in regard to marital and parental duty was, of course, due to their belief that the world was coming to an end at once; that is, the material world was to be supplanted in one generation by a spiritual world in which immortality would be apparent and future generations unnecessary. That has not occurred. But the early Christian might point out that as his method was not generally adopted it has not been proved a failure.

KINGDOM COME

And in fairness we must admit that if faith is the condition, the *modus operandi* of the miracle, we can not disprove the miracle in any condition of unbelief. We must take our umbrellas when we pray for rain, and applying the theory to birth and death, we may not forget the connection between the cradle and the grave. In short, it will be difficult to achieve immortality by conscious evolution while clinging fast to the customs of mortality. The man who hopes to achieve eternal life can not logically provide for his own heirs. He can not be a child of God and the father of God's other children; he can not agree that life has a beginning without consenting to its having an end.

In this connection may be mentioned a curious verse in one of those discussions of the future which have caused alarmed speculation among literal theologians: "Woe unto them that are with child . . . in those days!"* In view of the Christian healings of human ills this seems peculiar, and it is indeed a contradiction of Isaiah's promise that the Shepherd shall "gently lead those that are with young." But the prophet's verse applied to life in general, while Christ was speaking of the "last judgment"—that is, the ultimate decision about right and wrong as an immediate preface to heaven and immortality.

The apocryphal books indicate that in the lives of the disciples after Christ there was active preaching against the sexual view of creation, as well as consistent efforts to achieve practical immortality. In the accounts of the acts of Andrew and Thomas such stress is laid on discouragement of sexual relationships as to account obviously enough for the martyrdom of these disciples and indeed, if no other reason were wanting, for the failure of their gospels to attain canonical recognition.† To-day we are hardly surprised at the difficulties they encountered through efforts to establish celibacy among Indian converts or in the Roman army.

*Luke 21:23.

†The story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5) is typical of many anti-marital stories in the apocrypha. Perhaps its survival is due to its economic interest.

Perhaps it is to this mistaken missionary zeal that we owe the disappearance of the idea in its original form. For while celibacy has been preached by certain Christian groups from that day to this, celibacy in segregated groups was not the original plan. Thomas and Andrew preached rather celibacy in families or in mixed society—that is, they encouraged giving up sexual intercourse but made no effort to keep men and women apart. As the obvious advantage of celibacy should be the abolition of sexual barriers the earlier idea seems rather the more preferable, though doubtless the more difficult to enforce from without.

And while, as intelligent modern people opposed to salvation by force, we may take a warning from the difficulties encountered by Thomas and Andrew and refrain from urging heavenly standards upon an earthly world, there is no reason for overlooking logical implications of Christian teaching merely because they are not readily fitted into our present arrangements. Still less is there reason for overlooking teachings flung on the scrap-heap as impractical when changed conditions make them, for us, not only practical but practised.

Thus there is, I think, in view of our present habits a legitimate interest in a quotation attributed to Christ by the Gospel according to the Egyptians, of which only fragments remain. According to one fragment, on being asked how long men should die the Lord answered, "So long as women bear children."* The same gospel relates that Salome asked further when this should be generally known, and was told, "When ye have trampled on the garment of shame, and when the two become one and the male with the female is neither male nor female." A similar quotation is, "I came to destroy the works of the female," the comment of Clement of Alexandria being, "By female he means lust; by works, birth and decay."

We may as well overlook the slur on the female; it seems reasonable to suppose to "destroy the works" could mean to release

*This and following quotations from the Oxford Press edition of New Testament Apocrypha, translated by M. R. James (1924).

KINGDOM COME

from labor, or to free from a curse. But Clement's interpretation as to birth and decay is interesting.

Of course I do not think it likely that many people of our generation will philosophize upon this point, or any phase of the theological questions I have touched on. Ours is not a world given to theological speculation. Those who do see significance in these things have, I think, quite another problem to consider. It is: can we achieve the results appropriate to the conscious application of a spiritual law by its unconscious application from a material standpoint?

Granted, that is, that the saint's relinquishing of family and home ties for the sake of an imminent heaven might bring him there, can heaven be nearer also for those who relinquish family and home ties for practical and selfish reasons?

The most hopeful answer can, I think, be found in the Hindoo scripture which promises, "Whoever approaches Me in any form, in the same form do I approach him. In every case and condition men follow by My path."* We have an abiding tendency to worship God in a stock and a stone, but strangely He does seem now and then to assume these forms and answer our prayers. It is true that if our approach is by way of chemical and mechanical control of life we must expect the answer in an ectogenic infant rather than in the Incarnate Word, but there will, no doubt, be an answer.

All this of course applies to parenthood as an important accomplishment, not to parenthood for fun. The thing most essential seems to be that we should not feel too great a personal responsibility for the continuation of the universe; we are forgiven everything except the ambition to be as gods. Perhaps, after all, it was meant that we should reach heaven by care-free travel rather than by overmuch carefulness. Perhaps the childishness we are assuming to please ourselves will please God too; perhaps it was never His plan for shades of the prison house to close about the growing boy. At any rate, paralleling

**Bhagavad Gītā*, ch. IV.

those observations as to the conflict between mental growth and sex consciousness which I quoted in an earlier chapter, there is in the Gospel of Thomas this clue as to the mind of Christ: "He that seeketh me will find me in children from seven years old and upwards, for there am I manifested who am hidden in the fourteenth age."

So it may be then that when we come to resign our claims as viceroys ruling petty states with the power of life and death we shall profit not only in proportion to the purity of our intentions but to the becomingness of our practise. And somehow we shall qualify for the promise "If children, then heirs" . . . Heirs of a world of sunrises and sunsets and stars, of mountains and deserts and blue water, of ships and wharves and railway trains and printing-presses; heirs of the earth that may turn out to be heaven when we have learned to use instead of abuse it.

APPENDIX

INSTEAD OF A BIBLIOGRAPHY

THERE are in the card catalogue of the New York public library between three and four hundred references under the heading "Sex," and at least as many more under "Marriage." If you will skim through these or an equivalent collection and read all that offer the least promise, you will learn a great deal about the progress and diversity of human opinion, but I am not sure that you will be greatly enlightened otherwise. For it happens that, doubtless through no fault of the cataloguing system, many of the most valuable sources of information are not indexed under these heads.

On the other hand less impersonal sources of information about books are apt to be biased, and I warn you now that I shall in this section give preference to those authorities intelligent enough to agree with me.

To start at the very beginning, it may be assumed that you know all about Plato as the source of many more intelligent ideas about love than the careless use of the adjective derived from his name would suggest. I have already referred to the clear distinction made in the *Laws* between the various kinds of love, and the methods of control therein set forth. This, I think, is the most interesting of the dialogues with regard to the present subject, both as preaching and as prophecy; for the proposals to lessen sex consciousness by means of community meals and community exercise have been fully carried out in our restaurants and on our beaches.

But the *Laws* are better at telling what to avoid than what to do. As positive suggestion there is the speech attributed to Aristophanes, in the *Symposium*, which describes the theory of complements. Here, however, it must be remembered that in writing of love Plato spoke for an age in which love between men and women was almost unknown, certainly unacknowledged. He could condemn sex on grounds comprehensible to any intelligent person with an eye to spiritual values, but he could not describe romantic love as a substitute because he lacked the essential basis of equality.

It is, however, significant that the essentially romantic theory of complements has always been developed by those philosophers who minimized the importance of sex attraction; while those who approved sex were satisfied with indiscriminate combinations. As it is obvious, too, that the former philosophy offers the best basis for contented celibacy, it seems to me the one worth tracing through the centuries.

Christianity might have been expected to supply the basis of

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

equality that would permit an application of the complementary idea in romantic terms, but this was not the immediate result. It was, indeed, some time before the sex emphasis of monasticism was even lightened by a perception of the Platonic theory of the unimportance of sex. And when in the ninth century Johannes Scotus Erigena sought to combine Christian and Neo-Platonic philosophy he was accused of heresy on more than a hundred counts.

This Irish monk who lived in France, died in England and was called Scotus wrote a book called *De Divisione Naturæ* in which he undertook to prove that there was, in fact, no division in nature. The conflict between the sexes and the whole conflict between good and evil in the world he sees as due to our confused view of creation and our mistaken acceptance of Jehovah and the Adam man. He points out detailed discrepancies between the first and second chapters of Genesis, and asks what kind of dust could be made into the image and likeness of God. The whole Adamic universe he describes as the product of a mistaken assumption, a dream creation in which man is incomplete and imperfect, in which the sensual instincts represented by Eve are freed and followed, and which, being essentially false, need not endure.

But the medieval church was not interested in discussions intended to prove that in a wide-awake world the conflict between sense and sensibility would be no more, division of sex after the manner of animals would be abolished, and man's life would be managed after the manner of the angels, being multiplied without sex by "*intellectualibus numeralis*." Instead of listening to his plea for spiritual unity in place of duality church authorities ordered John's book to be burned and legend tells that he was stabbed to death by the pen-points of his own students. No kinder pens have as yet translated his writings out of medieval Latin into English, and perhaps I should not have given space to so inaccessible an author. But John the Scot is, as far as I know, the only man of his time and one of the few men of all time to classify sex not only as an evil but as a hoax on humanity.

Among modern or relatively modern followers of the Platonic tradition perhaps the most important is Otto Weininger. Born in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a suicide at twenty-three, he yet managed to publish at twenty-one a book, *Sex and Character*, which was recognized at once as a worth-while achievement and is still extensively quoted. Weininger has been pronounced a genius and a madman, and it is hard to avoid the trite conclusion that he was both. To those intelligent enough to profit by the genius and overlook the madness, his book is interesting and profitable.

The first half of the fat volume explains the theory of complements more clearly, I believe, than any other writer has explained it. For Weininger was no inspired plowboy; he was at twenty-one a

APPENDIX

recognized scientist, and his biological premises and psychological guesses seem to stand surprisingly well the test of comparison with those more recent. (*Sex and Character* was written in 1901, so that a time longer than Weininger's lifetime separates us from it.)

His explanation of the theory of complements is briefly that all persons exhibit both masculine and feminine qualities in varying proportions, and are attracted by those who possess feminine and masculine qualities in the reverse proportions required to make a balanced whole. So is explained the preference of "masculine" men for "feminine" women, the equal attraction between intermediate types, and also the abnormalities of maladjustment and perversion. Weininger not only develops the theory to the limit but reduces it to a mathematical formula.

On this feat rests his claim to genius, for when it is done he can do no more. Hereafter his insanity appears—though it is the insanity of the logician with a wrong premise, never the insanity of the wandering mind.

Proceeding with apparent logic from his complement theory, Weininger next proposes to imagine, as abstract ideals, the pure masculine and the pure feminine types. It is here that he forces us to remember that he is only twenty-one, and writing in German nearly thirty years ago. For having evolved a theory to account for all types on the basis of "male and female created He them" meaning something of both in everybody, Weininger evidently grew sex conscious and panicky over being considered anything but one hundred per cent. male. The best way to prove complete masculinity seemed to be the assertion of masculine superiority, and so he assigned to the masculine ideal all the virtues, including superiority to sex instinct, and to the feminine ideal all the vices, including absorption in sex.

This, of course, is very quaint, and has caused feminists to call him unkind names. I can not agree with them; to me he has simply made a mistake in terminology, has exhibited in his book the habit of jumping to conclusions shown in his untimely death. If the sensitive feminine mind in reading Weininger can remember his own statement that a man's judgment of women is merely indicative of the sort of women he knows, and then translate his diatribes against femininity into diatribes against stupidity, vanity and animality, as indeed they are, there is little reason for offense.

And Weininger must be given credit for this at least—in reducing woman to zero he does not recommend her as a plaything. He invites her instead to outgrow her feminine character, urges men to approve her progress away from the feminine: "Man must free himself of sex, for in that way, and that way alone, can he free woman. . . . She must certainly be destroyed, as woman; but only

to be raised again from the ashes—new, restored to youth—as a real human being.”*

Even in the latter half of the book there is intelligence; it's too bad that Weininger shot himself before some one took him quietly into a corner and demonstrated to him that his first beautiful com-

M
W

plementary equation involving — falls to nothing if $W=0$.

From Plato to Weininger, you see, the romantic idea of complements and the practical idea that sex was unimportant have alike been nullified by the assumption of feminine inferiority. Because of the ancient division of labor it seemed impossible for otherwise brilliant philosophers to condemn sex without condemning women too.

Oddly enough the missing romantic link will have to be supplied by way of the extremely prosaic movement that began by asking mere economic justice for the feminine half of humanity. The point made by John Stuart Mill that you can not tell what subject peoples will do when freed is the logical reply to Weininger, even though *The Subjection of Women* antedates *Sex and Character*.

But best of all as a dose of common sense for Weininger would have been Cicely Hamilton's *Marriage as a Trade*. This cleverly written book, published twenty years ago and still fresh as a daisy, I can not too strongly recommend. In it (without reference to him) Weininger's conclusions that women are unmoral, that they are matchmakers, that they are not geniuses, are accepted and explained; and the explanation throws a light on feminine nature which should be valuable to any man. As the writer puts it simply: "Practically every woman I know has two distinct natures: a real and an acquired; that which she has by right of birth and heritage, and that which she has been taught she ought to have—and often thinks that she has attained."

If you prefer masculine observation to feminine confession there is W. L. George's *The Intelligence of Woman* which, like Weininger's book, has been unpopular with one group of feminists, but which seems to me essentially fair in that it accounts for poverty in its subject on the ground, reminiscent of Miss Hamilton's, that "Each man and woman has two heredities: one the ordinary heredity from two parents and their forebears, the other more complex and purely mental—the tradition of sex."

And now, in order to appreciate the real value of these traditions of sex, we may add to the list of significant books those which, by charting human customs in all their variability, reduce tradition to its proper value. I have quoted from Frazer's *Golden Bough*; Wes-

**Sex and Character*, p. 345.

APPENDIX

termarck's *History of Human Marriage* is a more specialized study in the same field which offers entertaining opportunity to trace parallels between various tribal customs and those of our own time.

Trial marriages, for example, are not new, nor is pre-marital experience—in some tribes girls earned their dowries by prostitution. In other tribes brides with previous experience, and even with children, have been so preferred that strangers were hired to precede the husband. Divorce is not new; the Eskimos trade wives. Sentimental respect for prostitution is not new; courtezans were looked on with great respect in Java, regarded as public benefactors in Easter Island, and even given a monopoly of clothing by the Saliras. Late marriages are not new; among the Iroquois a man who married before thirty was considered effeminate. Feminine initiative is not new; the girls in the Torres Straits proposed until the missionaries stopped them.

A natural effect of this dissemination of knowledge as to evolution in sexual traditions is a more liberal attitude toward the sacredness of sex. If sex limitations meant one thing in New Guinea and something quite different in Greenland perhaps we can handle them without awe.

A recent book which takes advantage of anthropological discoveries to prove its points is Paul Bousfield's *Sex and Civilization*, from which I have already quoted. Doctor Bousfield's book is especially valuable in reducing not only psychic but physiological handicaps. The only fault I can find with it is omission of the point that the handicaps which affect women directly are not without indirect effect on men.

Most interesting of all literature against sex using the anthropological basis is the book by Mathilde and Mathias Vaérting which has been translated into English as *The Dominant Sex*. In this amazing volume you will find a mass of evidence painstakingly assembled to prove that certain qualities of character and even of physical make-up, certain business and social activities have not always been masculine monopolies but have been the signs of dominance, and that they have been exhibited by women who have in certain periods and societies gained the upper hand. The contention is that instead of conquering in these signs the dominant sex assumes them as it conquers, and imposes the signs of dependence upon the vanquished.

Thus, to consider physical beauty, convention requires that the dependent sex be small, young and fat; the dominant sex must be strong and sexually neutral in appearance. This, to take one example, explains the insipid-appearing statues of those Pharaohs of the period of feminine dominance in Egypt, while suggesting that such idealization may be no more representative of Egyptian men than present-day magazine covers are of real girls.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

The Vaërtings extend their findings to cover political and social activities, morals, modes of dress and indeed all aspects of life in the man's state, the woman's state and in those rare instances of approach to equality. In the last connection I think you will find it interesting to compare their generalizations with recent changes mentioned at the beginning of this book.

In *The Dominant Sex* no attempt is made to explain the swing from feminine to masculine dominance, but my own guess is that the former was possible only where life was simple enough to make maternity no serious handicap. The likelihood of a reverse swing will then depend on the degree to which birth control removes this deterrent to feminine success in a complicated society.

This brings us to the family as the final reason for clinging to sex distinctions; and most of the volumes which urge the all-importance of sex nowadays argue from the assumption that reproduction is the most important duty of humanity. Continuing in the line of freedom, Malthus set the ball rolling for emancipation from parental obligation as to quantity, and the Behaviorists of our own time offer a release from the standpoint of quality. On these points enough has been said in preceding chapters, and I shall conclude with a list of the books which other people may mention to you as important, and a few which I include for reasons of my own.

It is a deep regret that I can not include any of the best examples of the truly romantic attitude of mind; but the romanticists have chosen to speak in parables and it is not customary to include fiction on lists of this sort. Perhaps it is safe to assume that an intelligent reader will need no guide to romance.

Finally, lest a bibliography seem a dry thing, I want to remind you in presenting it that it is no trifle to consider that you as the heir of all the ages are privileged to combine their wisdom.

You must have noticed how the authorities I have mentioned supply one another's deficiencies after, perhaps, a gap of centuries. I mentioned that Weininger needed Cicely Hamilton or W. L. George, but how many more such needs are spread over the library shelves! What could Plato not have done with the "word-world" of Behaviorism, or with the demonstrated effect of emotion on the body? What could John the Scot have done with Doctor Watson's discussion of "the gut" as his synonym for the Snake in the Eden allegory?

You have the ability in your own mind to bring the jagged ends together and dovetail them smoothly. You can be Plato and Weininger and John the Scot all at once; you can even be Cicely Hamilton and Mathilde Vaërting. You can, in short, if you have enough *Patience*, paraphrase Colonel Calverley of the Heavy Dragoons and after rattling off the equivalent of

APPENDIX

"The dash of a D'Orsay, divested of quackery—
Narrative powers of Dickens and Thackeray . . .
Flavour of Hamlet—the Stranger, a touch of him—
Little of Manfred (but not very much of him)—"

follow the further directions to

"Take of these elements all that is fusible—
Melt 'em all down in a pipkin or crucible—
Set 'em to simmer and take off the scum,"

and the residuum will be a *very* intelligent young man.

For I have only touched the high spots of the vast stores of written experience open to you. The fact is that rakes have recorded every misstep in their progress so that you might profit vicariously by their experiments; saints have sweated to set down for you the rules by which they lived unspotted from the world, and women have artlessly revealed in print the secrets of flattery so that you may take warning.

Now I have written for you this *Guide*. If you blunder through life it's your own fault.

SEX DIFFERENCES

BOUSFIELD, PAUL: *Sex and Civilization*. Dutton, 1925.

Quoted in text and mentioned above.

ELLIS, HAVELOCK: *Essays in Wartime*. Houghton, 1917.

Man and Woman. Macmillan, 1927.

The first, written years ago, argues strongly for sex differences; the second gives later and more liberal views.

GALLICHAH, CATHERINE: *Women, Children, Love and Marriage*.

Cranton, London, 1924.

The Truth about Women. Dodd, Mead, 1914.

Radical feminism.

GEORGE, W. L.: *The Intelligence of Woman*. Little, 1916.

Masculine liberality. Mentioned above.

HALDANE, CHARLOTTE: *Motherhood and Its Enemies*. Doubleday, Doran, 1928.

Feminism of the Mother's-Day brand.

HAMILTON, CICELY: *Marriage as a Trade*. Moffatt, Yard, 1909.

Mentioned above.

HARDY, E. J.: *What Men Like in Women*. Dillingham, 1906.

The author of *How to Be Happy Though Married* says that men thrive on flattery and cites the German Emperor as a happy example. (Note date of book.)

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

LANGDON-DAVIES, JOHN: *A Short History of Women*. Viking Press, 1927.

Calls the worship of fertility and the right to work the two safeguards of woman's happiness. (If she's not satisfied with one curse, give her another.)

LUDOVICI, ANTHONY: *Woman, A Vindication*. Knopf, 1923.

Lysistrata; or Woman's Future. Dutton, 1925.

The first mentioned in text. The second a logical arraignment of human inconsistency from the materialist point of view; pessimistic from the writer's standpoint, but optimistic for many of us.

MENCKEN, H. L.: *In Defense of Women*. Goodman, 1918.

Interesting reading for either side.

PEDERSEN, VICTOR: *The Woman a Man Marries*. Doran, 1927.

Woman's place is in the maternity ward.

PUTNAM, EMILY: *The Lady*. Putnam, 1910.

A detached and polite study of a detached and polite phenomenon.

VAERTING, MATHILDE and MATHIAS: *The Dominant Sex*. Doran, 1923.

Mentioned above.

WESTERMARCK, E. A.: *History of Human Marriage*. Macmillan, 1921.

Mentioned above.

MORALS

CALVERTON, V. F., and SCHMALHAUSEN, SAMUEL D., (ed.) *Sex in Civilization*. Macauley, 1929.

Important chiefly for its revelation of divergence and discontent among those who prefer the first to the last word of the title; as an example of the former see Abraham Myerson's criticism of Freudian theory, and of the latter, Schmalhausen's "The Sexual Revolution."

CALVERTON, V. F.: *The Bankruptcy of Marriage*. Macaulay, 1928.

Suggests it might be easy to solve the sex question if we could abolish love.

COLLINS, JOSEPH: *The Doctor Looks at Love and Life*. Doran, 1926.

The Doctor Looks at Marriage and Medicine,

Doubleday, Doran, 1928.

Old-fashioned morality highly flavored with Freud and garnished with epigrams which are occasionally contradictory.

GROVES, ERNEST: *The Marriage Crisis*. Longmans, 1928.

Anti-trial marriage. Good on showing the difference between enduring affection and s. a., but on the whole a little dull.

HAIRE, NORMAN: *Hymen, or, The Future of Marriage*. Dutton, 1928.

APPENDIX

Distinctly practical rather than romantic. However, it seems polygamy will not be compulsory.

JOAD, C. E.: *Thrasymachus, or, The Future of Morals*. Dutton, 1926.
Foresees changes due to birth control and economic independence of women; that the changes will be less than expected; that they will be accompanied by a return to Puritanism; that the hope of the future is in religion.

KEYSERLING, COUNT HERMANN (ed.): *The Book of Marriage*. Harcourt, 1926.

An encyclopedia translated from the German but not alphabetically arranged. Keyserling's own articles are on the whole the most interesting, but other contributors have been quoted in the *Guide*.

KIRCHWEY, FRED (ed.): *Our Changing Morality*. Boni, 1924.

Collected magazine articles, the best Charlotte Perkins Gilman's (quoted in text) and Floyd Dell's "Can Men and Women Be Friends?"

LINDSEY, JUDGE BEN B. and EVANS, WAINWRIGHT: *The Revolt of Modern Youth*. Boni and Liveright, 1925.

Companionate Marriage. Boni and Liveright, 1927.

Something is undoubtedly wrong.

SCIENCE

AYRES, C. E.: *Science, the False Messiah*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1927.

The antidote for too much hope in test-tubes.

CANNON, WALTER: *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage*. Appleton, 1920.

Everything except love—or is it included in the total?

FISCHER, JACQUES: *Love and Morality*. Knopf, 1927.

Suggests divorcing the two as biologically sound procedure.

Also suggests use of auto-vaccine for "endocrine disturbance."

GEDDES, PATRICK, and THOMSON, J. ARTHUR: *Evolution of Sex*. Humboldt, 1890.

Biologic background and old-fashioned common sense.

HALDANE, J. B. S.: *Possible Worlds*. Harper, 1928.

Daedalus; or, Science and the Future. Dutton, 1924.

Quoted in text.

HAMILTON, G. V.: *A Research in Marriage*.

Quoted in text; available only to physicians and other serious investigators.

HAMILTON, G. V., and MAE GOWAN, KENNETH: *What is Wrong with Marriage?* A. and C. Boni, 1929.

A popular version of Dr. Hamilton's research, covering psychological rather than physiological phases.

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

JUNG, CARL G.: *Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases Publishing Co., 1915.

Quoted in text.

THOMSON, J. ARTHUR: *Control of Life*. Holt, 1921.

Broad-minded biology.

WATSON, J. B.: *Behaviorism*. Norton, 1925.

The Ways of Behaviorism. Harper, 1928.

Quoted in text.

WEININGER, OTTO: *Sex and Character*. Putnam, 1906.

Mentioned above.

RELIGION

COUTTS, JOHN K.: *The Church and the Sex Question*. Doran, 1926.
Orthodox Protestant morality.

CONFERENCE ON CHRISTIAN POLITICS, ECONOMICS AND CITIZENSHIP, Birmingham, England, 1924: Report, *The Relation of the Sexes*. Longmans, Green, London, 1924.

A mile-stone in ecclesiastical progress which prefers moral repudiation to fear of consequences. Denounces the double standard but clings to the value of s. a. in preaching.

EDDY, MARY BAKER: *Science and Health*. Christian Science Publishing Society, 1917.

A chapter on marriage and one on Genesis in the "Key to the Scriptures" section give the Christian Science view.

GRAY, ARTHUR H.: *Men, Women and God*. Doran, 1922.

Good orthodox Christianity.

ROYDEN, A. MAUDE: *Sex and Common Sense*. Hurst and Blackett, London, 1922.

Justifies its title, especially on "the right to motherhood."

SCHARLIEB, MARY (ed.): *Sexual Problems of Today*. Williams and Northgate, London, 1924.

A compendium of orthodox morality.

SEARS, CLARA E.: *A Short Treatise on Marriage*. Rochester, N. Y. 1867.

The Shaker solution.

STUDDERT-KENNEDY, HUGH A.: *The Impatience of a Layman*. Century, 1928.

Unorthodox Christianity—one remarkable chapter on marriage.

SWEDENBORG, EMANUEL: *Conjugal Love and Its Chaste Delights*. American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society, 1917.

The idea of romantic complements somewhat cloyingly expressed.

APPENDIX ECONOMICS

- BENNETT, ARNOLD: *Married Life*. Doran, 1917.
Good on the job of supporting a family.
- HARD, WILLIAM: *Women of Tomorrow*. Baker and Taylor, 1911.
Quoted in text.
- MILL, JOHN STUART: *The Subjection of Women*. Longmans, 1870.
Mentioned above.
- PRUETTE, LORINE: *Women and Leisure*, Dutton, 1924.
Quoted in text.

LOVE

- CARPENTER, EDWARD: *Love's Coming of Age*. Doran, 1911.
A thriller in the age of bicycles; now almost conservative by comparison, but still not too tame.
- ELLIS, EDITH M. O.: *The New Horizon in Love and Life*. Macmillan, 1921.
Rather better than the early conclusions of the more famous member of the family.
- LÜCKA, EMIL: *Eros: The Development of the Sex Relation through the Ages*. Putnam, 1915.
Regards identification of spiritual and material love as the *summum bonum*. Mentioned in text.
- SHERMAN, STUART P.: *My Dear Cornelia*. Atlantic Press, 1924.
One passage lucidly explains the difference between physical and mental attraction.

CELIBACY

- GALLICHAN, WALTER: *The Great Unmarried*. Laurie, London, 1916.
Thinks it's terrible to be that way.
- TOLSTOI, LEO: *Social Evils and Their Remedy*. Methuen, London, 1915.
Thinks it's the part of true religion to be that way. Excellent recipe for chastity marred by a strong belief in the importance of what is given up.

CHILDREN

- BUREAU, PAUL: *Towards Moral Bankruptcy*. Constable, London, 1925.
Worried over race suicide in France.
- DELL, FLOYD: *The Outline of Marriage*. Richards, London, 1927.
Clever arguments for birth control.
- WIGGAM, ALBERT: *The New Decalogue of Science*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1923. *The Fruit of the Family Tree*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1924.
Better Babies. Quoted in text,

INDEX

- About Ourselves*, 173, 208
 Adam, 61, 62, 72, 73, 76, 85, 93, 97,
 153, 269, 273, 274, 292
 Adamic creation, 72, 292
 Adolescence, 222, 230, 234, 268
 Adoption, 262-265, 283
 Adultery, 78, 113, 139
 Adventure, 102, 126, 128, 206, 281
 Advertising, 22, 49, 86, 259
 Affinities, 138, 180
 Affinity, mental, *see* Complements;
 physical, 137, 177, 178, 184
 Africa, 206, 267
 Age, and youth, 245, 261; at marriage,
 33, 187, 229; mental, 266, 267
 Age of Innocence, 22
 Aikman, Duncan, 270
 Airedale minds, 49
 Airplanes, 52, 170, 205, 271
 Al Koran, 214
 Alcohol, 107, 202, 269
 Alice Adams, 184
 Alimony, 54, 210
 Alpine climbing, 167, 206
 Alving, Mrs., 228
 Amalfi, 206
 Amateurs, 136-140, 143
 American Mercury, 110
 Amherst, 229
 Amoeba, 93
 An Imperial Rescript, 274
 Ananias, 287
 Ancients, Shavian, 40
 Anderson, Sherwood, 110, 119
 Andrew, 287, 288
 "Angel of the Crimea," 159
 Angels, 24, 79, 89, 130, 182, 268
 "Animal magnetism," 99, 125
 Anthropologists, 59
 Anthropology, 20, 294
 Antichrist, 81
 Any Wife to Any Husband, 38
 Apartments, 34, 35, 51, 208, 246
 Aphrodite, 85
 Apocrypha, New Testament, 287, 288,
 290
 Apparel, 39, 41, 166, 197. *See*
 Clothing
- Apple, 73, 103, 124, 126, 230
 Applesauce, 124
 Approval, desire for, 45, 48
 Arawaks, 59
 Army Intelligence Tests, 266
 Asceticism, 81
 Aspasia, 159
 Athletics, 43
 Australian tribesmen, 68

 Baal, 85
 Babbitt, 31
 Bachelors' quarters, 34, 208
 Back to Methuselah, 40, 53, 105, 254,
 258
 Balance, 62-68, 110
 Bankruptcy of Marriage, 229
 Barrie, Sir James M., 62
 Bathing suits, 41, 243, 246
 Bats as masculine emblems, 68
 Battersea Bridge, 127
 Beauty, 151, 162, 185, 186, 191-194,
 222-224, 295
 Beauvais, Bishop of, 88
 Befuddlement, 82, 239
 Behaviorism, 95, 96, 296
 Behaviorist, 95-97, 99, 103, 121, 122,
 244, 245, 254, 255, 259, 263; baby, 103
 Benefit of clergy, 51, 83
 Best sellers, 110
 Better Babies, 283
 Bhagavad Gita, 78, 289
 Bicycles, 29, 36
 Birth control, 107, 126, 178, 179, 203,
 215, 243, 246, 250, 257-260, 263
 Birth rate, 247, 248, 272
 Bisch, Louis, M. D., 94
 Bishop of Beauvais, 88
 Blessed Virgin, 70
 Blue-Eyes, 58
 Boaz, 74, 75
 Body, importance of, 40, 56, 57, 135,
 162, 175, 176, 190, 216, 223, 234-239
 Book of Common Prayer, *see* Prayer-
 book
 Book of Marriage, The, 68
 Book of Mormon, 214
 Books, lists of, 297-301

Boston clergyman, 20
 Bottle feeding, 215
 Bousfield, Paul, 57, 95, 295
 Boy Scouts, 39
 Brazil, 59
 "Bride of Christ," 202
 British Social Hygiene Council, 205
 Brooklyn Bridge, 226
 Brown, Professor William, 102
 Brownies, 58
 Browning, 38
 Buddha, 286
 Buddhist practise, 84
 Bulwer-Lytton, 123
 Bunsen burner, 89
 Bureau, Paul, 171, 205
 Burns, 119
 Bus conductor, 214
 Business, 29, 32, 60, 156, 204, 274-277.
 See Jobs, Work
 Bynner, Witter, 209
 Byron, 59, 227

 Cabell, James Branch, 72, 108
 Calverton, V. F., 229
 Cana, wine of, 76, 82, 285
 Capital punishment, 260
 Capitalism, 45, 120, 263, 278
 Careers, *see* Jobs, Vocations, Work
 Caribs, 59
 "Carnal man," 74
 Carr-Saunders, Dr. A. M., 205
 Cat, ways of killing, 37
 Cauchon, Monseigneur, 88
 Caveman, 237
 Celibacy, 78, 215, 246, 288, 291; kinds
 of, 27, 131; genuine, 148, 199-210;
 nominal, 131-148; books on, 301
 Cell, 100
 Ceremony, marriage, 23, 164. *See*
 Marriage service
 Change, possibilities of, 100-105. *See*
 Evolution, Conscious Evolution,
 Progress
 Charles II, 227
 Charm, 224
 Chastity, 26, 27, 181, 202, 205, 230.
 See Celibacy, genuine
 Chesterton, G. K., 84, 104
 Child bearing, 73, 120, 157, 160, 288.
 See Curse of Eve, Motherhood
 Child mind, 80, 96, 130, 265-267, 290
 Childhood, 58, 95, 234, 266, 267
 Children, 19, 33, 79, 86, 149-152, 154-
 156, 159, 160, 164, 169, 171, 185-187,
 203, 225, 243-246, 250, 251, 256, 260-
 265; books on, 301

Children's bureau, 263
 China, 159, 191
 Chinese civilization, 200
 Chinese philosophy, 62. *See* Confucius
 Chivalry, 49, 172, 198, 279
 Choice, 86, 184, 210, 233. *See* Selec-
 tion, Taste
 Chorus, musical comedy, 43, 223;
 Wagnerian, 19
 Christian revolution, 76-83, 106; teach-
 ing, 85, 285-291
 Christian Scientist, 227
 Churches, 83-89, 149-151, 164, 172,
 217
 Cigarettes, 39, 111
 Civil War, 33, 36
 Clans, 243
 Clement of Alexandria, 288, 289
 Clendening, Logan, M. D., 235
 Clergyman, Boston, 20; English, 243
 Clothing, 43, 47, 60, 68 154, 168, 192,
 222, 223, 295
 Clubs, women's, 38, 146, 223
 Code, moral, 59, 68, 188, 211-219, 231-
 234, 240-241
 Coeducation, 63, 187, 219, 243, 283
 Colleges, 29, 36, 43
 Collins, Dr. Joseph, 58
 Columbus, 58, 281
 Comedy, 120-124, 183
 Comic Spirit, 121, 126
 Common clay, 132, 135, 231
 Companionate marriage, 24. *See* Trial
 marriage
 Companionship, 25, 50, 67, 150, 186,
 244
 Competition, 275
 Complements, 27, 64-69, 166, 173, 291
 Completeness, individual, 24, 63, 148
 Complexes, 48, 93, 152
 Concubinage, 215, 216
 Confucius, 188, 222, 262, 263
 Congeniality, 256, 257. *See* Com-
 panionship
 Connoisseur of beauty, 192-194
 Conquest, 127
 Conscious evolution, 44, 90, 102, 103,
 254, 287
 Conservatism, 20, 21
Constant Wife, The, 228
 Continence, 82, 205, 212; intellectual,
 64. *See* Chastity, Self-control
 Constitution, 219
 Contraceptives, 107, 258. *See* Birth
 control
 Convention, 240. *See* Code

INDEX

- Cooperation, 65, 66, 241, 274, 282.
See Partnership
 Cornelia, 159
 Corsicans, 95
 Cosmetics, 41, 50, 222, 223
 Counterfeit love, 50-55, 144, 190
 Courtship, 162, 186, 196-199
Cradle Snatchers, 118
 Creation, accounts of, 72, 292
 Crime, 248, 260, 269-270
 Crimea, 159
 Crusades, 83
 Crushes, 147
 Cupid, 125, 272
 Curse, of Adam and Eve, 61, 73, 76,
 85, 153, 269, 273, 274
 Custom, 208. *See* Manners
 Customs, tribal, 59, 249, 295

Daedalus, 105, 209
 Darby and Joan, 170
 Darning, 34
 Darwin, 52, 89, 90, 91, 250
 Davis, Katharine B., 258
De Divisione Naturæ, 292
 Death, 52, 79, 84, 102, 125, 235, 238,
 285
 Death rate, 248
 Decalogue of science, 92
 Decoration, household, 92, 276
 Delicatessen food, 34
 "Delusion of opposites," 82
 Democracy, 60
 Democrat, 65
 Dependence of women, 32, 220
 Dependent children, 263
 Descartes, 105
 Desire, 69, 78, 93, 122, 144, 163, 204,
 227, 228, 237, 238
 Despotism, benevolent, 253
 Diamond Jubilee, 212
 Diana, 158
 Dickens, 119, 297
 Discoveries, physiological, 52; psycho-
 logical, 54, 94
 Discrimination, 237. *See* Choice,
 Connoisseur, Sophistication, Taste
 Disease, 52, 84, 205, 248
 Ditch digger, 60, 186
 Divorce, 24, 76, 77, 178, 180-184, 281,
 295
Doctor Looks at Love and Life, The,
 58
 Dolls, 22, 86, 152
Dominant Sex, The, 295
 Don Juan, 228
 Donkey, 130
 Double Standard, 36, 139
 Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan, 180
 Dragons, 126, 129
 Drama, 116-118, 139, 281
 Dramatists, 69, 151
 Dreiser, Theodore, 110, 119, 125
 Dress, women's, 43, 60, 222, 223. *See*
 Clothing
 Drunkenness, 82, 107, 202
 Dumb wives, 194-196
Duncan, Isadora, 254
 Durant, Will, 196, 197
 Dusting, 275
 Dutch, 281

 Early marriage, 229, 230
 Ears, 55
 Easter Island, 295
 Economic independence, man's, 229;
 woman's, 170, 186, 187
 Economic pressure, 250; security, 222
 Economics, books on, 301
 Ectogenic infant, 289
 Eden, 296. *See* Garden, Paradise
 Education, 61, 66, 96, 109, 172-174,
 185, 196, 230, 260
 Edwards family, 263
 Efficiency, 276
 Egypt, 295
 Egyptians, Gospel of, 288
 Einstein, 104
 El Dorado, 130
 Electricity, 66
 Elephants, 249
 Eligibility, *see* Requirements, marital
 Ellis, Havelock, 227, 267, 272
 Elohim, 63, 70-72, 74, 85
 Emerson, 21
 Emetic School, 113-121
 Emotion, 188-190, 234-240
 Emotional security, 46
Encyclopædia Britannica, 248, 252
 End of the world, 271, 292
 England, birth rate in, 247, 248
 English clergyman, 243
 English police courts, 270
 English prayer-book, *see* Prayer-book
 Environment, 187, 254-256
 Eohippus, 101
 Equality, 65, 77, 80, 82, 95, 158, 279,
 292; of income, 274
Eros: The Development of the Sex
Relation through the Ages, 137
 Erskine, John, 72, 124
 Eskimos, 295
Essay on Comedy, 123

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

Essay on Sensation and the Sensiferous Organs, 105

Essay on the Principle of Population, 248

Essays in Wartime, 228, 272

Esther, 74, 75

Eternal life, 84, 102, 285-290

Eton, 124

Eugenics, 100, 251-255, 257, 260

Eve, 61, 72-76, 153, 222, 241, 273, 274

Evolution, 89-92, 100-105. *See* Change, Progress

Exemplar, duties of, 45

Exercise, 196, 204

Experience, 136-143, 182, 226-232, 259

Experiment, 25, 26, 131, 242

Exploration, 206, 281

Fairy-tale, 126, 192, 193

Fall, 73

"Fallen man," 228; women, 119

Family, 33, 48, 79, 144, 151, 242-246, 251, 260-265, 269, 283

Famous Women of the Future, 157

Fantis, 267

Farm Bloc, 71

Fashions, 43. *See* Clothing

Fastidiousness, 61, 178

Fasting, 107

Feminists, 54, 213

Fever patient, 53

Finesse, feminine, 219-225

First Corinthians, 116, 236

First love, 48-50, 129, 181, 184, 185

Fish, 96, 101, 102, 105, 249

Flapper, 40

Flattery, 42, 45, 198, 213, 220, 297

Flirt, 138

Flood, 85

Flowers, 66

Flying, 52, 129, 265

Folkways, 59

Food, 19, 23, 34, 47, 122, 163, 205, 232, 258

Ford, Ford Madox, 208

Forgiveness, 182, 183, 228

Fosdick, Harry E., 88

Fountain of Youth, 130

France, 292

France, Anatole, 194

Frazer, 69, 249, 286, 294

Free speech, 59, 132

Freedom, 210, 211, 225, 281

Freshmen, college, 100, 199, 207

Freud, Sigmund, 67, 89, 95, 118

Freudian, 92-98, 113, 119, 267

Friction, 64, 177

Frontiers, 169, 170, 184, 250

Fruit of the Family Tree, The, 254

Galahad, 124, 203

Gallantry, feminine, 138

Galton, Francis, 252

Garden, 72-74, 125, 221

Gaul, 127

Generative system, 107, 230

Genesis, 70, 71, 97, 230, 292

Genius, 63, 66, 292, 293

Gentiles, 96, 273

Gentlemen, 62

Geology, 91, 100

George, W. L., 43, 294, 296

Germicides, 154

Gerould, Katharine Fullerton, 115

Ghosts, 228

Gills, 90, 102

Girton, 124

Goats, 165, 167, 212

Gold bricks, 226

Gold diggers, 35

Golden Bough, The, 69, 249, 286, 294

Golden wedding, 168

Good women, 38, 113, 133, 212, 221, 222, 231

Gospel of Thomas, 290

Grace, before meals, 23; of God, 49

Grail, 124

Grammar, 66

Grandfather, *see* Shaw, Bernard

Great Adventure, 128

Great God Brown, The, 281

Great-grandparents, 167-169

Great men's sons, 252, 253

Great Similarity, 262

Greek ideal, 235, 236

Greenland, 295

Guatama, 84

Guest, Edgar, 157

Guinevere, 124

Gycurus, 59

Habit, 97, 99, 164

Haldane, J. B. S., 89, 105, 106, 209, 267

Hamilton, Cicely, 294, 296

Hamilton, G. V., 139, 196, 229, 258

Handicap, woman's, 36, 152, 154, 178.

See Curse of Eve

Happiness, 24, 108, 111, 122, 125, 137, 156, 188, 218, 242

Hard, William, 264

Harris, Corra, 213, 215, 217

Hart, Dr. Joseph K., 244

Hart, Roxie, 270

Harvard, 264

INDEX

- Harvey, 52
 Hatrack, 119, 144
 Hazing, 207
 Health, 205
 Hearing, 55, 148
 Heaven, 19, 53, 77, 78, 109, 129, 177, 180, 198, 280, 284, 289, 290
 Hebrews, 78, 96
 Height, of modern women, 43
 Held, John, 40
 Hell, 19, 39, 77, 161, 180, 232
 Henley, W. E., 69
 Herd instinct, 104, 207. *See* Mob psychology
 Heredity, 92, 95, 251-257, 263
 Himalayas, 206
 Hindoo scripture, *see Bhagavad Gita*
History of Human Marriage, 295
 Hollywood, 83
 Holmes, John Haynes, 88
 Home, 23, 34, 79, 242, 243, 246, 269, 277, 283
 Home brew, 87
 "Home nest," 34
 Home work, 276
 Homemaking, 277
Homo sapiens, 190, 217
 Homosexuality, *see* Perversion
 Honesty, 194, 198, 222
 Housekeeping, 30, 32, 156, 170, 185, 276, 277
Human Body, The, 235
 Human relationships, 45. *See* Family
 Humor, *see* Comedy
 Huxley, Julian, 205
 Huxley, Thomas, 52, 90, 105
 Hypnotism, 141, 207, 240

 Imitation, women's, 45
 Immaculate Conception, 107
 Immigrants in industry, 29
 Immigration, 43
 Immortality, 78, 84, 102, 107, 285-290
 Improvement, self, 49, 51, 173
 Impulse, *see* Instinct.
 Incompatibility, 177, 180
 Incorruptibility, 81
 Incubators, 151
 Individuality, 256. *See* Personality, Self
 Industry, 29. *See* Business, Work
 Inertia, 61, 164
 Infantilism, 163, 217
 Infidelity, 230. *See* Adultery, Divorce
 Inge, Dean, 248
 Inhibitions, 93, 132
 Initiative in courtship, 196-199, 295
 Innocence, 39, 81, 143, 145, 222; Age of, 22.
 Instincts, 86, 92-94, 97-100, 204, 209, 211, 217, 238
 Intellectual association, 63
 Intelligence, in women, 192, 194-196
Intelligence of Woman, The, 43, 294
 Intelligence Tests, Army, 266
Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, The, 105, 274
 Inter marriage, 273
 "Intermediate" types, 148, 293
 Intoxication, 67, 188-190, 204, 225. *See* Drunkenness
 Invention, 64, 129, 276. *See* Miracles, scientific
 Involuntary celibacy, 208, 209
 Irish goats, 165
 Iroquois, 295
 Isaiah, 197, 287

 Java, 295
 Jealousy, 117, 141, 179
 Jefferson, 219
 Jehovah, 70-74, 76, 292
 Jerusalem, 78
 Jesus, 76-79, 96
 Jews, 273
 Joan of Arc, 282
 Jobs, 29, 30, 61, 63, 156, 170. *See* Business, Work
 Johannes Scotus Erigena, 292, 296
 John the Scot, *see* above
 Johns Hopkins, 96
 Johnsonian attitude, 42
 Judges, English, 252
 Judgment day, 85, 287
 Jukes family, 263
 Jung, Carl G., 101
 Justice, 104, 270

 Kaiser, 165, 166
 Karnak, 127, 128
 King James, 51
 Kipling, 63, 108, 129, 130, 274
 Knight, 30, 273
 Koran, 214
Kreutzer Sonata, The, 112, 129

 Labor, 120, 138, 245, 274, 278. *See* Work
 Lady, 62
Lady Baltimore, 189
 Lancelot, 124
 Lang, Andrew, 191
 Language, 59, 117, 127

- Lateran Council, 273
 Law, criminal, 269-270; divine, 23, 71, 86, 87; Levitical, 74; Mendelian, 251, 254; natural, 23, 90, 238.
 Laws, breaking of, 218, 270. *See* Crime
 Laws, of Plato, 148, 291
 Laziness, 61, 224
 Leda, 286
 Leeds, Nina, 115, 118
 "Legalized prostitution," 163
 Legend, Adamic, 72, 74; pagan, 286; tribal, 68, 72
 Levitical law, 74
 Leviticus, 217
 Libbey, Laura Jean, 110
 Liberty, 80, 158, 210, 211, 281
 License, 51, 69, 163
 Life, eternal, 84, 102, 285-290; human, 249, 260
 Lightning rods, 20
 Lith, 222
 Limitations, time and space, 51, 52, 105, 209
 Lindsey, Judge Ben B., 161
 Literature, 108-130, 207, 230. *See* Comedy, Drama, Novels, Romance
 Locke, W. J., 124
 Loneliness, 65, 173
 Loos, Anita, 123, 194
 Lorelei, 75, 123, 195, 222
 Lotharios, 226
 Love, 46-55, 94, 144, 165, 177, 189, 190, 193, 268; books on, 301
 "Love nest," 50, 269
 Lücka, Emil, 137
 Ludovici, Anthony, 214-217

 Madonna, 158
 Maeder, Alphonse, 68
 Magazines, 22, 44, 88, 128, 151, 213, 223, 295
Magic Island, The, 189
 Mahomet, 206
Major Barbara, 262
 Malthus, 207, 248, 296
Man and Woman, 267
 "Manly men," 62, 168
 Mann Act, 163
 Mann, Thomas, 68
 Manners, change in, 40-42, 278
 Mantegazza, Dr. Paolo, 205
 Marquis, Don, 102
Marriage as a Trade, 294
 Marriage, kinds of, 26, 149, 150; practical, 150-164; romantic, 165-184
 Marriage service, 21, 23, 84
 Mars, 272
 "*Mary Gloster*," *The*, 38
 Material progress, 63
 Materialism, 81, 237, 238
 Materialist, 104, 108, 129
 Maternity, *see* Motherhood
 Matrimony, *see* Marriage
 Matter, properties of, 104
 Meals, girls who marry for, 276
 Mechanistic age, 106; universe, 49
 Medes and Persians, 75
 Memory, 141-143, 182, 193, 231
 Mencken, H. L., 120, 121
 Mendelian law, 251, 254
 Meredith, George, 123
 Methodist Church, 217
 Mexico, 72
 Middle Ages, 89, 158
 Mill, John Stuart, 294
 Millennium, 107
 Miracles, Christian, 76, 87, 96, 107, 285, 286, 287; scientific, 88, 92, 96, 106, 107
Misalliance, 246
 Misalliances, 77
 Miscegenation, 67, 273
 Missionaries, 95, 113, 295
 Mob psychology, 207, 240. *See* Herd instinct
 Modesty, 64, 68, 152, 155, 278
 Mohammedanism, 125
 Monasticism, 146, 200-202
 Money, 35, 46, 47, 112, 202
 Monogamy, 37, 167
 Moral code, 59, 68, 188, 211-219, 231-234, 240, 241
 Moral guardianship, 36, 212
 Moral infantilism, 217
 Morals, change in, 36-40, 106. *See* Moral code. Books on, 298
 Moses, 146
 Mosquitoes, 249
 Mother, 22, 28, 29, 193, 221, 233
 Mother-complex, 48, 152
 Mother Goose, 59
 Motherhood, 151-160, 164, 215
 Mother's Day, 158
 Mount Athos, 200
 Moving pictures, 50, 207, 243
Mrs. Warren's Profession, 120, 212
 Multiplication, 215, 249, 251, 258
 Murder, 98, 116, 117, 269, 271
 Music, 69, 207
 Musical comedy, 43, 123
 Mystery, 56, 127, 225, 230

INDEX

- Names, 263, 264
- Naomi, 74, 75
- Narcissism, 223
- Natural History Museum, 190
- Natural law, 23, 90, 238
- Natural man, 104, 178, 272
- Natural selection, 91, 185
- Nature, 23, 25, 26, 260
- Neanderthal mind, 214
- Nebraska, 121
- Negro, 273
- Nepotism, 243
- New Guinea, 295
- New Jersey merchant, 277
- New Testament, 51, 76, 83, 247; Apocrypha, 288-290
- New York public library, 291
- Newspapers, 50, 87, 212, 243, 270
- Nice people, 49, 278; women, *see* Good women
- Night, darkness of eliminated, 209
- Nightingale, Florence, 160
- Nominal celibacy, 131-148, 163
- Norsemen, 281
- North Pole, 128, 206
- Northwest Mounted Police, 112
- Novelists, 22, 133, 151, 154
- Novels, 109, 110, 112, 136. *See* Romance
- Obey, 29, 84
- Objects of marriage, 149-151
- Octopus, 102
- Office work, 30, 31, 156. *See* Business, Jobs, Work
- Old Man, 70, 73, 104
- Old Testament, 74, 78, 172, 214, 217, 247
- Old-fashioned girl, 30, 220, 276
- Olympus, 119
- One Man, 129, 137
- One Woman, 129
- O'Neill, Eugene, 117, 118
- Oriental views of women, 172, 201, 222, 288
- Origin of Species, The*, 91
- Original Sin, 92
- Orphans, 262, 263
- Over-sexed minds, 66; persons, 148, 216
- Overstreet, H. A., 173, 208
- Owls as feminine emblems, 68
- Oxford, 102, 124
- Paradise, 85, 90, 125, 129. *See* Garden, Heaven
- Paragon, 37
- Parental domination, 244
- Parenthood, 78, 154, 259, 272, 289. *See* Birth control, Children, Eugenics, Family, Motherhood
- Parricide, 98
- Parrish, Herbert, 190
- Partnership, 165-171, 244
- Patience*, 296
- Patriarchs, 172, 212, 214
- Patriotism, 54
- Pearl, Dr. Raymond, 252, 253
- Peary, 206
- Pedersen, Victor, M. D., 142
- Pedestal, 37
- Periodicity, 152-154
- Permanence, of marriage, 167, 180, 186, 190, 233
- Perpetual motion, 130
- Persia, Shah of, 206
- Persians, 75
- Personality, 97, 174. *See* Individuality
- Perversion, 119, 145-148, 267, 283, 293
- Peter Pan, 267, 283
- Petting, 36, 100
- Pharaohs, 274, 295
- Pharisees, 76
- Philosophers as parents, 252
- Phoenicians, 281
- Physical affinity, 137, 177, 178, 184
- Physical attraction, 99, 175. *See* Counterfeit love, Sex appeal
- Physical changes, 43. *See* Evolution
- Pioneers, 138, 168-171, 249, 283
- Plans of life, 210, 211. *See* Experiment
- Plato, 40, 53, 54, 142, 146-148, 236, 291, 294
- Platonic friendship, 117
- Play, spirit of, 265, 266
- Plays, *see* Drama
- Playwrights, 69, 151.
- Plural marriages, 168, 264
- Plutarch, 146
- Point of view, 284
- Police Gazette*, 110
- Political differences, 65
- Polyandry, 117
- Polygamy, 117, 264
- Polynesia, 52
- Population, 216, 242, 243, 246-250; 263, 272
- Posdnicheff, 181, 182
- Possessiveness, 137, 171, 179, 228
- Possible Worlds*, 267
- Poverty, 169, 248

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

- Power, 90, 106, 156, 176, 204, 219, 221, 234, 236, 285
 Prayer, 108, 287
 Prayer-book, 149, 150, 165, 166
 Pre-marital experience, 136-143, 181, 200, 229-230, 232, 295
 Pre-marital frankness, 25
 Priest, 51, 245
 Primary urges, 101. *See* Instincts
 Princesse Lointaine, 130
 Princeton graduate, 60, 61
 Principle, 71
 Privacy, 178
 Privileges; feminine, 41, 42, 220-225; masculine, 225-231
 Progress, 82, 91, 100-108, 130, 131, 173, 234, 279
 Prohibition, of alcohol, 107, 202; of marriage, 81
 Promiscuity, 117, 124, 132, 230, 278
 Prophecy, 105, 108, 203
 Proportion, 238, 258; comedy a sense of, 121, 122. *See* Taste
 Proposals, 196-199
 Prostitution, 85, 119, 133-136, 143-145, 163, 295
 Prulette, Lorine, 157, 158
 Psalmist, 39, 245
 Psychic research, 129
 Psychology, 54, 92-100, 113, 119. *See* Behaviorism, Freud, Watson
 Pterodactyl, 101
 Public opinion, 27, 151. *See* Herd instinct, Mob psychology
 Pulitzer award, 117
 Pure Food and Drugs Act, 25
 Puritan, 83, 86, 132
 Quaker in business, 167
 Qualifications. *See* Choice, Requirements
 Quantum, 104
 Queen Victoria, 89
 Queens of Beauty, 172
 Queens of Virtue, 172.
 Race preservation, 99, 249. *See* Population
 Racial prejudice, 273
 Rape, 85, 163
 Realism, 113-121
 Realist, 108, 125, 126
 Reconditioning, 96, 103, 219, 240, 241
 Redistribution, divorce as means of, 180
 Reform, 27, 76, 173. *See* Change, Progress
 Regeneration, 103
 Reincarnation, 256, 285
 Relatives, 54, 243, 265. *See* Family
 Relativity, 104, 242
 Religion, 38, 70-91, 284-290; books on, 300
 Religious celibacy, 200-202
 Religious teachers, 38. *See* Churches, Christian revolution
 Renaissance, 158
 Reno, 138
 Repression, 98, 231
 Republican, 65
 Requirements, marital, 185-188
Research in Marriage, A, 139, 196, 229, 258
 Resurrection, 79, 285
Revolt of Modern Youth, The, 161
 Revolution, 177, 278; Christian, 76-83. *See* Change, Progress
 Ridicule, 122
 Roe, E. P., 110
 Romance, 108, 109, 124-131, 167, 179-184
 Romance languages, 127
 Romany patteran, 127
 Rome, 89, 127, 176
 Rotary, 146
 Royalty, 231, 253
 Rubens, 44, 114
 Ruskin, 62
 Ruth, 74, 75
 Sacrament, 56, 163
Sacred Flame, The, 139
 Sacrifice, 56, 115, 225, 232, 285
 Sadducees, 79, 80
 Saint James, 200
 Saint John, 200
 Saint Paul, 51, 74, 76, 81, 84, 96, 104, 146, 160, 161, 202, 239, 285
 St. Simon, Duc de, 187
 Salary, 29, 32
 Salome, 288
 Salvation, 96
 Santa Claus, 266
 Sapphira, 287
 Savages, 56, 100, 171, 249
 Schopenhauer, 216
 Science, 89-108; books on, 299
 Scot, John the, 292, 296
 Scotus, Johannes, *see* above
 Scouts, 39
 Seabrook, W. B., 189
 Secondary sexual characteristics, 57
 Security, emotional, 46
 Selection, 184-199; natural, 91

INDEX

- Self, 97, 174
- Self-consciousness, 102, 280
- Self-control, 82, 108, 140, 202, 204, 210, 211, 226, 231, 258, 285
- Self-improvement, 49, 172, 173
- Self-perpetuation, 251, 253
- Self-preservation, 101
- Sensation, 205
- Sensitiveness, 142, 234
- Sentimentalists, 115, 123, 188
- Sentimentality, 119, 123, 134, 241
- Separation as a test of love, 190
- Serpent, *see* Snake
- Servant, body as a, 56, 176
- Sex, 54-69, 110, 127, 166, 268, 291
- Sex and Character*, 292-294
- Sex and Civilization*, 57, 95, 295
- Sex antagonism, 217, 231, 278; appeal, 42, 75, 179, 191, 212, 214, 221, 270; consciousness, 78, 148, 201, 217, 219, 280, 290, 291; differences, books on, 297; worship, 231
- Shackleton, 206
- Shad, 249
- Shah of Persia, 206
- Shakers, 246
- Shamelessness, 41, 280
- Shaw, Bernard, 19, 44, 45, 53, 61, 69, 80, 88, 103, 105, 118, 120, 183, 187, 202, 246, 254, 258, 262, 273, 274, 278, 281
- Shears, 64
- Sherman, Stuart, 206
- Shoplifting, 269
- Sins of the father, 254
- Sioux, 170
- Skyscrapers, 266
- Slave, 19, 176, 257; tactics, 42
- Small Tranquillity, 262
- Smoking, 39
- Snake, 73, 124, 230, 240, 296
- Social code, 59, 282. *See* Manners, Moral code
- Social equality, 273
- Socialism, 45, 274
- Society page, 60
- Socrates, 142
- Sons of God, 86, 71, 91; of men, 130
- Sophistication, 226-228
- Sorrento, 206
- Soul, 57, 62, 106, 113, 239, 285
- South, 36
- South Pole, 206
- South Seas beauty, 67
- Southerner, 54, 273
- Space limitations, 51, 52, 105, 209
- Spaniards, 281
- Spectator*, 248
- Speculation, scientific, 89, 105; theological, 289
- Speech, 59, 177
- Speed, 107, 205
- Spencer, Herbert, 248, 249
- Sportsmanship, 35, 127
- Standard, Double, 36, 139; moral, *see* Moral code
- Standardization, 66, 217
- Standing-room, 250
- Standpatters, 20, 104
- Stanley, 206
- Statistics, birth control, 258; education and marital happiness, 196; experience, age of, 229; illicit experience, 139; heredity, 252; marriages of Yale and Harvard graduates, 264
- Statue, 37
- Steinach, 52
- Stepmothers, 265
- Stevenson, R. L., 59
- Stimuli, 103, 104
- Strange Interlude*, 117, 259
- Straton, Rev. John Roach, 89
- Subjection of Women, The*, 294
- Sublimation, 208, 209
- Subway, 60, 250
- Sucker lists, 226
- Suicide, 97, 247
- Sumner, W. G., 59
- Sunday-school, 92
- Sunday-supplement science, 60
- Superior Man, 84
- Superiority, feminine, 36, 40; masculine 84, 293
- Support, 30, 31, 162
- Survival, *see* Immortality [tion
- Survival of the fittest, 116. *See* Evolution
- Swedenborg, 80, 198
- Swimming, 41, 176, 261
- Symposium*, of Plato, 142, 291
- Tabloid newspapers, 50
- Taboos, 59, 64, 68, 146, 202, 232, 237, 241, 273
- Tails, 101
- Tarkington, Booth, 31, 184
- Taste, 21, 144, 183, 232-234, 239-241
- Temperance, 202. *See* Self-control
- "Tender women," 28
- Tennessee, 89
- Tests, Army Intelligence, 266
- Tests of love, 190, 191
- Texas, 89
- Thackeray, 196, 197, 297
- Theological speculations, 289

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE

- Theology and science, 90
Theory of Psychoanalysis, 101
 Thomas, 287, 288, 290
 Thompson, Sadie, 279
 Thomson, J. A., 205
 Thoreau, 206
 Tibet, 200
 Time limitations, 51, 52, 105, 209
 "Tired business man," 31
 Tolerance, 119, 179
 Tolstoi, 112
Towards Moral Bankruptcy, 171, 205
 Toys, 86, 182, 230
 Trader Horn, 228
 Tradition, 48, 55, 84, 104, 151, 207, 245, 279, 294
 Training, 57-59, 217, 224, 281. *See* Education
 Travel, 22, 33, 58, 126, 281
 Tree, family, 255
 Tree of Knowledge, 72
 Tree of Life, 73
 Trial and error, method of, 25
 Trial marriage, 177, 295. *See* Companionate marriage
 Triangles, 181, 281
 Tribal customs, 59, 249, 295; legends, 68, 72
 Turk, 201
 Undershaft, 262
 University, 63, 214, 219. *See* Harvard, Oxford, Princeton, Yale
 U. S. Army Intelligence Tests, 266
 U. S. Department of Labor, 263
 Vaccination, 227
 Vaërtling, Mathilde and Mathias, 295, 296
 Vamping, 42, 213, 220, 231. *See* Sex appeal
 Vampire, 134
 Vanity, 171, 221-225
 Vashti, 75
 Vegetarianism, 183, 205
 Venus, 272
 Vestigial organs, 154, 201
 Vicar of Wakefield, 196
 Victoria, Queen, 89
 Victorian, 22, 83, 114, 196, 279
 Villains, 114, 141
 Virgin, 70, 115
 Virgin Birth, 286
Virginibus Puerisque, 59
 Vitality, employments for, 19
 Vocation, choice of, 30, 45, 156, 157.
 See Business, Jobs, Work
 Voronoff, 52
 Voting, 36
 Vulgar fractions, 67
 Wagnerian chorus, 19
 War, 98, 99, 100, 153, 231, 247, 248, 271-273
 Water into wine, 76, 87, 88, 285
 Watling Street, 127
 Watson, Dr. John B., 89, 96, 255, 296.
 See Behaviorism
Way of All Flesh, The, 24
 "We," 63
 Weakness, feminine, 66; masculine, 212, 221, 228
 Weininger, Otto, 292-294, 296
 Wells, H. G., 125
 Wellslain hero, 174
 West Point, 283
 Westermarck, E. A., 295
What Every Woman Knows, 62
 Widdemer, Margaret, 46
 Wiggam, Albert E., 254
 William the Conqueror, 255
 Wine of Cana, 76, 82, 285
 Wister, Owen, 189
 Wolseley, Lord, 267
Woman, A Vindication, 214, 215
 "Womanly women," 62, 167
Women and Leisure, 157
Women of Tomorrow, 264
 Wordsworth, 119
 "Word-world," 103, 296
 Work, 153, 154, 203, 204, 273-277. *See* Business, Jobs
 Yale, 102, 264
 Yellow badge, 273
 Young Women's Christian Association, 197
Young Woodley, 184
 Youth, 224, 266; and age, 245, 261
 Ziegfeld, 43, 223
 Zion, 120

THE INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE TO MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY

WHAT IS IT ABOUT?

What happened to Home and Mother. . . .
Falling in love—and falling out. . . . Sex differences, their causes and conquest . . . consolations of Religion, dogmas of Science, promises of Romance. . . . The two kinds of marriage. . . . The two kinds of celibacy. . . . Courtship and the court of domestic relations. . . . Beauty contests and the connoisseur. . . . The man who marries a dumb wife. . . . Woman's right to propose, man's to refuse. . . . Manly freedom and womanly wiles. . . . How to be happy though single. . . . Farewell to the family. . . . Children's rights. . . . Behaviorism and birth control. . . . Mars, Venus and the baby, or sex as a cause of war. . . . Ethics of sex appeal.

IS IT SERIOUS OR HUMOROUS?

Both—as was *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, of which the present volume is not a parody. On the contrary, the author maintains, it is a parallel study of a subject of even greater importance to humanity.

WHO WROTE IT?

Juanita Tanner, explained in a preface as the daughter of Ann Whitefield and John Tanner in Shaw's *Man and Superman*. Some will surmise that the pseudonym conceals a man. Some will say—but let them say.

WHO WILL READ IT?

Men—and women—who aren't married and wish they were; who aren't married and are glad they aren't; who are married and are glad they are; who are married and wish they weren't. Men and women who like a breath of fresh air in the midst of heated discussion.
Men and women.

